CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

0-315-08936-9

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

48 Canadian Theses Division | Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

56853

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Annette Ramrattan

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
Feb. 14, 43	Guyana.

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

604D Michener Park, Edmonton T6H5A1.

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Theory of Catholic Schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton, 1884 - 1960

University — Université

Alberta.

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M. Ed.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1982	Dr R. J. Carney

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
March 12/82	A Ramrattan

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Theory of Catholic Schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton, 1884-1960

by

© Annette Ramrattan

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate

Studies and Research in Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Education

In

The History of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Annette Ramrattan

TITLE OF THESIS The Theory of Catholic Schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton, 1884-1960

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Annette Ramrattan

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

604 D Michener Park

Edmonton, Alberta

T6H 5A1

DATED February 15, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Theory of Catholic Schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton, 1884-1960"
submitted by Annette Ramrattan
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education
in History of Education.

Robert J. Carney
..... Supervisor

D. Macleod
.....

Jean Judson
.....

Date February 15, 1982

ARSTRACT

The theory of Catholic schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese (1884-1960) emanated from Vatican educational directives, developed by nineteenth century papal figures. Catholic schooling existed in the North-West Territories prior to school legislation. The first School Ordinance (1884) endorsed the existing system of dual education. A series of ordinances between 1885 and 1892 gradually changed the dual system to a unitary one with minority, separate school rights.

The Oblates of Mary Immaculate, a nineteenth century French missionary order, arrived in Canada in the 1840's. Some of them were placed in the North-West Territories. By 1884, the Diocese of St. Albert had already been established. In 1912 the Edmonton Archdiocese and the Diocese of Calgary were created from this area.

The Oblate hierarchy was incensed by the 1892 School Ordinance, the last of the series of ordinances that changed schooling in the territories. Leduc adequately summarized hierarchical reaction to that ordinance in his treatise Hostility Unmasked.

The Oblates were French-speaking clerics who supported ultramontanism, a philosophy that intensified in nineteenth century France. Ultramontanes regarded the pope as supreme and accepted Vatican pronouncements unquestioningly. They opposed state control of education and felt that religious education should take precedence over all other curricula materials.

Between 1884 and 1920 the Oblates, V. Grandin and E. Legal

headed the Diocese of St. Albert and, subsequently, the Archdiocese of Edmonton. The theory of schooling endorsed by these two leaders and their clerical subordinates was a replication of the theory enunciated by Pius IX and Leo XIII and reiterated by their successors. This theory remained unchanged throughout the period of Oblate control.

Between 1920 and 1960 two members of the English-speaking secular clergy, H.J. O'Leary and J.H. MacDonald, served as Archbishops of Edmonton. Despite the leadership change, the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton continued to endorse the theory of schooling developed by the Vatican. Between 1936 and 1960, new issues such as financial problems, the threat of progressive education and the apathy of Catholics towards Catholic schooling, were raised by the hierarchy. However, there was no move to question or modify the theory throughout the period. In fact, the English-speaking Catholic hierarchy were as supportive of the theory as their French-speaking predecessors. Further, they utilized American materials to support their contention that Catholic schools were necessary and that religious and secular education should be integrated.

In conclusion, the Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton was based on a set of directives developed by the Vatican and accepted unquestioningly by the local hierarchy. This theory did not change throughout the period, despite the impact of modernization, moves towards state control of education and progressive educational theory. In other words, the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese (1884-1960) continued to explicate a theory that had developed in the nineteenth century and had remained unexamined and unquestioned for over a century.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. R.J. Carney, for his encouragement, patience, understanding and constructive criticism throughout the duration of this project. I appreciate the assistance of Dr. H. Hodysh in suggesting revisions to the thesis and the willingness of Dr. R.C. MacLeod to serve as a member of the examining committee.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance given by Fathers B. Holland and C. Kindervater and Mr. J. Cormack in locating some of the research materials. I also appreciate the skilful assistance provided by my typist, Terry Diduch. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband Darsh and my son Narsh for their patience and understanding throughout this period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Explanation of Terms	6
	Need for the Study	10
	Nature of the Study	11
	Delimitations of the Study	12
	Sources and Related Literature	13
	Secondary Sources (1884-1960)	13
	Pastoral Letters and Speeches	18
	The Western Catholic	19
	ACEA Bulletins and Pamphlets	19
	Minutes of ACSTA and Catholic School Districts	20
	Interviews and Inquiries	21
	Organization of Material	22
	Footnotes to Chapter I	25
II	ULTRAMONTANISM AND SCHOOLING: A GENERAL PERSPECTIVE	28
	Introduction	28
	Papal Directives	30
	Interpretation and Application of Papal Directives in the United States	49
	Canadian Interpretations of Papal Schooling Directives	66
	Conclusion	74
	Footnotes to Chapter II	77

CHAPTER PAGE

III THE OBLATES AS SCHOOLMEN (1875-1920) 85

Introduction 85

Territorial School Law and the Oblates (1875-1905) 89

Oblate Education in Alberta (1905-1920) 104

Conclusion 115

Footnotes to Chapter III 118

IV REAFFIRMING PAPAL DIRECTIVES -- THE THEORY OF SCHOOLING IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF EDMONTON (1921-1946) 122

Introduction 122

Pastoral Letters and Speeches by Bishops and Archbishops . 124

Catholic Truth Broadcasts 134

Western Catholic Materials 140

Minutes of Catholic School Board Meetings 160

Conclusion 165

Footnotes to Chapter IV 169

V REASSESSMENT AND REORGANIZATION; TRADITIONALISM VERSUS PROGRESSIVISM -- THE THEORY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLING (1947-1960) 174

Introduction 174

Pastoral Letters and Speeches by Bishops and Archbishops . 176

ACEA Bulletins and Publications 198

Western Catholic Materials 220

Minutes of ACSTA (1958-1960) 229

Catholic School Districts (1947-1960) 229

Conclusion 244

Footnotes to Chapter V 248

CHAPTER PAGE

VI CONCLUSION 255

Concluding Remarks 255

Recommendations for Further Study 263

Footnotes to Chapter VI 266

BIBLIOGRAPHY 267

Chapter I

Introduction

Roman Catholic separate and public schools are part of the institutional structure of formal education in the Province of Alberta. Catholic missionary and educational activities, in the area now known as Alberta, began in the 1840's and continued after the region became part of the North-West Territories. Schooling came under territorial government control in 1884 when the first North-West Territories School Ordinance was passed and a dual system of education was introduced.[1] Subsequent school legislation, culminating with the School Ordinance of 1901, reduced the power of the Roman Catholic section of the system. The 1901 School Ordinance was the last of a series of ordinances that changed school administration in the North-West Territories from a dual to a unitary system that guaranteed separate school rights to the minority. The Catholic hierarchy responded to these changes by confrontation, accommodation and negotiations with the territorial, federal and Alberta governments between 1884 and 1960.

Minority, in the context of the school ordinances, referred to the religious minority either Protestant or Roman Catholic, in a particular school district. For example, in what later became a predominantly Protestant district like Edmonton, the Roman Catholic minority had the right to establish separate schools. Similarly, in

a Roman Catholic public school district like St. Albert, the Protestant minority had separate school rights.

The system of schooling that developed between 1884 and 1901 continued, with minor modifications in terms of Catholic autonomy, until the early 1960's. When Alberta became a province in 1905 the educational system that had been established by the School Ordinances between 1884 and 1901 was retained; Roman Catholics, therefore, continued to have the right to establish separate or public schools depending on whether they were the minority or majority in a particular school district. A separate school could only be established by the minority if a public school was already in existence. Furthermore, in a district where there was no separate school the public school was supported by all the ratepayers, and was therefore responsible for the schooling of all children in that district. For example, when the St. Albert Public School District was established, it was supported by all the ratepayers of the area and had to accommodate the children of the Catholic majority as well as those of the Protestant minority.

The subject of this study is the theory of Roman Catholic schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton from 1884 to 1960. Since the date chosen to begin the study is 1884 and the Archdiocese of Edmonton was not established until 1912, discussion of Catholic schooling from 1884 to 1912 will be concerned with developments in the Diocese of St. Albert. The Catholic mission, established in St. Albert in 1861, was granted the status of a diocese in 1871 when the Oblate cleric, V. Grandin, was appointed the first bishop of the episcopal see of St. Albert.[2] Grandin died in 1902 and was

succeeded by E.J. Legal, another member of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. When the Archdiocese of Edmonton was created in 1912, Legal became its first archbishop. At the same time the Diocese of Calgary was detached from Edmonton and J.T. McNally, an English-speaking prelate, was appointed as the first bishop of the episcopal see of Calgary.[3] Legal died in 1920 and was succeeded in the Edmonton Archdiocese by H.J. O'Leary, the first English-speaking archbishop of Edmonton. He served until his death in 1938; his successor was J.H. MacDonald who retired in 1964. It should be noted that neither O'Leary nor MacDonald were Oblates. They were both secular clergy, born and educated in the Maritimes. They attended St. Francis Xavier College in their early years and received further scholastic and religious training in Rome.

The year 1884 was chosen as the starting point for this study because it was the year in which the first school ordinance of the North-West Territories was passed. Prior to that mission schools had existed, but the 1884 ordinance was the first piece of schooling legislation passed by the territorial assembly. Moreover, subsequent ordinances between 1884 and 1893 led to a period of debate and confrontation between the Catholic hierarchy and territorial government administrators over Catholic educational rights. The year 1960, the date chosen to end the study, is significant because of the reaction of the bishops of Alberta to the findings of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (1959). The Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta was important because it was the first major study of education undertaken in the province of

Alberta. The year 1960 is also a fitting point at which to end this study because it preceded Vatican II. That Council was expected to initiate changes in the Catholic perspective of life and theory of schooling.

Purpose of the Study

In this study an attempt will be made to identify the theory of Roman Catholic schooling that prevailed in the Archdiocese of Edmonton from 1884 to 1960. Other outcomes expected from this research are an understanding of what Roman Catholic schooling entails and why, according to the Catholic hierarchy, it can only be administered successfully by Catholic teachers in Catholic schools. It is also anticipated that the study will reveal why Roman Catholic leaders insisted that religious instruction and a religious atmosphere should not be left solely to the family and the church, but should be an integral part of schooling. In fact, according to the Catholic hierarchy, religion was not a subject to be taught but a way of life. Hence, it should permeate all school activities. The Catholic school was viewed as an essential institution for the intellectual and moral development of young Catholics.

The thesis of this study is that a theory of Catholic schooling existed and was in operation in the Edmonton Archdiocese and throughout the rest of Alberta between 1884 and 1960. It is further contended that this theory was based on papal directives that were accepted unquestioningly by the local hierarchy, that the theory did not change over the period under study, and that the basis of the

theory can be found in the recurrent themes emphasized by Catholic leaders in Edmonton, the rest of Canada, the United States and the Vatican.

Bishop Grandin and Archbishops Legal, O'Leary and MacDonald, the leaders of the Catholic church in Edmonton during the years 1884 and 1960, all supported a Catholic theory of schooling that had been enunciated by various papal authorities and disseminated throughout the Catholic world. The Catholic theory of schooling was based upon several essential themes developed by Leo XIII, his predecessors and successors. These themes were reiterated and endorsed by Pius XI in Divini Ilius Magistri(Christian Education of Youth), 1929. In this study six fundamental themes that were part of the papal theory of Catholic schooling will be examined to determine the extent to which they influenced the hierarchy in Alberta and whether the themes were modified or remained essentially the same throughout the period under study.

The six themes of the Catholic theory of schooling that will be examined are: the divine mission of the church to educate; the duties of parents regarding schooling; the need for Catholic schooling for all Catholic children; the permeation ideal of Catholic schooling; the responsibilities and characteristics of Catholic teachers; and the relationship between intellectual, moral and religious training. The role of the religious hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese with reference to schooling and the Code of Canon Law regarding education will also be discussed in the context of the themes outlined above. These themes were essential to the Catholic

theory of schooling since they provided the ideals that Catholic educators should work to achieve.

Explanation of Terms

It is necessary to define the term "theory" as it will be used to explain the Catholic viewpoint on schooling. It is also necessary to distinguish between "theory" and "ideology" and establish clearly that the Catholic viewpoint being examined was a "theory" of schooling, not an "ideology." E. Shils defines ideology as "one among the variety of comprehensive patterns of belief -- cognitive and moral, about man, society and the universe in relation to man and society -- which exist in differentiated societies."[4] According to Shils those who accept the ideology are expected to be completely subservient to it; in addition . . . "it is regarded as essential and imperative that their conduct should be completely permeated by it."[5] Shils further contends that ideologies are concerned with contact with sacred systems and manifestations of the sacred in the existent. Therefore, a religious belief system can be described as an ideology.

K. Mannheim suggested that ideology has two distinct and separate meanings -- the particular and the total:

> The particular conception of ideology . . . denotes that we are sceptical of the ideas and representations advanced by our opponent. They are regarded as more or less conscious disguises of the real nature of the situation . . .the total conception of ideology [refers] to the ideology of an age or of a concrete historico-social group, e.g. of a class, when we are concerned with the characteristics and composition of the total structure of the mind of this epoch or of this group.[6]

In other words, the total conception takes into account the entire "Weltanschauung" while the particular only takes in some assertions. Taking Catholics as a "concrete historico-social group" in Mannheim's total meaning of ideology, it can be concluded that the Catholic belief system is an ideology. This conclusion is further substantiated by Shils' arguments referred to earlier. Therefore, in this study, Catholicism will be treated as an ideology and the Catholic perspective on schooling as a theory of schooling emanating from this ideology. Having established that Catholic ideology is a belief system, it is necessary to determine what a theory is and whether it is appropriate to describe the Catholic perspective on schooling as a theory.

There is no single definition of theory available that will satisfy all sociologists, historians or philosophers. However, sociology provides three universally used words for classifying the main theoretical types: -- analytic, normative and scientific.[7] For the purpose of this discussion whenever the word theory is used it will be in the context of normative theory as described by Cohen -- normative theories "elaborate a set of ideals to which one may aspire."[8]

In An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (1957) D.J. O'Connor observes:

> Ultimately, all the questions that can be asked about a given educational system can be reduced to two:
> (i) what is held to be valuable as an end?
> (ii) what means will effectively realize these ends?[9]

Further, he suggests that a theory is simply "a general conceptual background to some field of practical activity," therefore, when

"we contrast theory with practice we are merely referring to a set or system of rules or a collection of precepts which guide or control sections of various kinds."[10] O'Connor's description of the metaphysical part of educational writings is very relevant to this discussion:

> Statements of this kind [metaphysical] are not believed, in the first place, just because they form part of an educational theory. They are accepted rather because they feature in a philosophy or theology which is already believed on other grounds . . . If we hold that every human being is an immortal soul created by God for an external destiny and placed here on earth in a state of probation; that belief has an important effect on the aims and content of the educational system that we shall be prepared to support.[11]

From the above it is apparent that the Catholic viewpoint on schooling is closely connected to general Catholic ideology. In addition, although the Catholic perspective on schooling cannot be regarded as an empirically testable theory, it is a theory based on a philosophy or theology that is already believed.

In Theories of Education (1963) J.P. Wynne observed:

> Educational theories . . . may be conceived either as a body of beliefs derived through a process of critical logical reasoning or as uncriticized attitudes applicable to educational problems. The first are sets of consistent principles . . . the second are loosely related sets of principles or doctrines which may or may not have intellectual support.[12]

Wynne's second type of educational theory could be used to describe the Catholic theory of schooling. According to Wynne the Catholic theory of education is a "supernatural-development theory of education" that is "empirically indefensible" simply because of its

reliance on supernaturalism.[13] In summary, the Catholic theory of schooling utilizes a set of doctrines that is supported by supernatural beliefs and is not defensible empirically because of its supernatural orientation.

In Evolution of Educational Doctrine (1969) E.J. Power summarizes the Catholic perspective on educational theory:

> Educational theory may be assigned the function of determining the broad purposes of education and then trying to evaluate the processes of pedagogy . . . Contained in the theory are answers to the most pressing of education's questions: who is being taught? Why is teaching undertaken at all? What content is employed? How are the means of education deployed? . . . Put in these terms, educational theory is a directive doctrine, which asks nothing from educational practice but that it be true to the theory as elaborated, and that it follows its precepts in day-to-day practice.[14]

Catholic authorities have been traditionally concerned with such perennial questions as who is being taught, why teaching is undertaken, what content is used, and how the means at the disposal of educators are deployed. Further, Catholic educational theory is based on a set of directions for teachers that is concerned with the broad purposes of pedagogy rather than the specifics. Power concludes his analysis of educational theory by pointing out that:

> Even when we want to be a friend of educational theory and affirm its worth in debate, we should be aware that theory sometimes stands as an impediment to pedagogical progress . . . whenever theory is regarded as a directive doctrine -- a set of directions for teachers -- certain obvious limits are imposed on educational action.[15]

The Catholic theory of schooling for the period under study was a directive doctrine for teachers that imposed limits on their action. Teachers were expected to be good Catholics, well-versed in the

doctrine of the church, who were willing to work within the limitations imposed by Catholic beliefs and practices.

As has been observed, the word theory can be used to refer to many different concepts. For example, a theory can be normative providing a general conceptual background to some field of practical activity as defined by Cohen and O'Connor. Further, using Wynne's arguments, the Catholic perspective on schooling can be classified as a theory about the supernatural that is empirically indefensible, or in Power's terminology, as a directive doctrine. Whenever the Catholic theory of schooling is discussed in this study the term theory will be used in the normative, conceptual, supernatural and directive contexts defined by Cohen, O'Connor, Wynne and Power.

The terms "schooling" and "education" will be used interchangeably throughout the study. This usage is necessary because most of the Catholic authorities who will be quoted, used the term "education" when referring to "schooling." "Schooling" usually refers to formal education in elementary or secondary situations. "Education" usually means the sum total of all learning experiences and is an on-going life-long process. The term "education" will, however, be used in its narrow sense of formal education throughout this study.

Need for the Study

Throughout the period of this study, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese maintained that schooling of Roman Catholic children could only be successful if it was carried out

in a Catholic environment. Many reasons for this position have often been given; however, the theoretical basis for this demand has not been clearly defined. There is need, therefore, for an examination of the arguments in support of Catholic schooling put forward by Catholic educational leaders and the bishops of Alberta as they relate to educational developments in the Edmonton Archdiocese. It is expected that this study of the theory of Catholic schooling in Edmonton from 1884 to 1960 will provide background information for studies of outcomes -- the results of the application of the theory. It could also provide the basis for an investigation of the Catholic theory of schooling in the post-Vatican II period.

Nature of the Study

Much has been written describing the political issues associated with establishing separate schools. The School Ordinances of the North-West Territories passed between 1884 and 1901 resulted in a lessening of Catholic influence over territorial schooling. The dual system of 1884 initially allowed Catholic leaders to regulate all aspects of schooling for Catholic children. That authority gradually diminished after the territorial government abolished separate educational sections and established a unitary Board of Education. The result was a school system which provided for public and separate schools, both financed by taxation and both subject to regulations of the Department of Education.

Throughout the struggle to retain Roman Catholic separate schools, the Catholic church vigorously defended its claim to its own schools. This was based on a particular belief system with regard to schooling. Separate schools or public Catholic schools (in some instances) were permitted to operate but religious instruction was limited to the last half-hour of the school day.

Delimitations of the Study

This study is limited to the theory of schooling of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the Archdiocese of Edmonton from 1884 to 1960 and the religious beliefs and convictions that influenced the development of that theory. It will focus on the papal directives that influenced Roman Catholic leaders to take a particular position regarding schooling. It will not examine the chronological development of schools and school districts nor the outcomes of the application of this theory. The practical operation of schools, including curriculum, text books and catechetical materials will not be examined unless they are relevant to the explication of the theory. In addition, the establishment of new schools or other related events will be referred to only as they relate to the subject matter. Similarly, the work of the Alberta Catholic Education Association and the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association will not be traced chronologically. The documents of these two associations are relevant only as they apply to the theory of schooling espoused by the Roman Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

This thesis will, therefore, study the theory of schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese to determine what the theory was between

1884 and 1960; if it changed at all during that period; the main sources of the theory; and the main spokesmen who articulated the theory. Papal directives, American Catholic educational literature and related documents, Canadian Catholic works and local materials are the main sources that will be examined. American Catholic materials are relevant to this study because, as will be shown in subsequent chapters, these materials were often used by the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese to justify their position on schooling. Non-Catholic materials will only be used to further explicate the theory of Catholic schooling that was at work in Alberta at this time.

Sources and Related Literature

The sources of data for this study ranged from secondary material that provided information for the period 1884 to 1960 to primary sources such as pastoral letters, Minutes of school district and Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association (ACSTA) meetings. The materials referred to for the period 1884 to 1960 either provide background information or are directly relevant to the articulation of the Catholic theory of schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Secondary Sources 1884-1960

Secondary literature related to this study can be classified under three headings: books, documents and theses related to education in Western Canada and the North-West Territories; books related to the Catholic church and separate schools in Canada; and books and theses related to Roman Catholic educational philosophy and the development of schooling in Alberta.

H. Leduc's Hostility Unmasked[16] was written in reaction to the Territorial School Ordinance of 1892. While opposing the ordinance on the grounds that it was designed to take away educational rights that had been granted to Catholics by the 1884 School Ordinance, Leduc also launched an attack on F.W.G. Haultain, Premier of the North-West Territories and D. Goggin, the Superintendent of Education, for their alleged anti-Catholic sentiments. His tract presents a good account of the ideological position of the Catholic hierarchy in the 1890's with regard to the school question, both in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. It also documents the theoretical position of the Catholic hierarchy regarding schooling for the entire period.

M.R. Lupul's book[17] is the most comprehensive examination of Roman Catholic educational development and Church-State relations in the North-West Territories. It provides background material regarding the Catholic position and a good outline of the political debate over education between the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the territorial government between 1875 and 1905.

S.T. Rusak's "Relations in Education between Bishop Legal and the Alberta Liberal Government, 1905-1920"[18] deals with some of the educational issues raised by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the first decade and a half of Alberta's history. This work is mainly descriptive and deals chronologically with negotiations, lobbying and correspondence between Bishop Legal and the provincial government over textbooks, the time prescribed for religious instruction, the French language in schools, a Roman Catholic normal school and a

French-Catholic school inspector. It is an invaluable source concerning Roman Catholic educational development in Alberta because it describes the background to the separate school question in Alberta, documents Anglo-French Catholic differences and stresses the fact that Legal's role was conciliatory and that he was seeking concessions through tireless lobbying rather than confrontation. Although it does not discuss educational theory specifically, the issues that it highlights are a useful guide to the Roman Catholic theory of schooling.

G.T. Daly's Catholic Problems in Western Canada (1921)[19] was the first work that dealt specifically with the Catholic school question in Western Canada. It documents the Catholic position prior to 1921 and clearly differentiates among the roles of the parent, the state and the school in the field of education. This book contributes to an understanding of the Catholic philosophy of life and theory of schooling. The author defines religion as "life itself" and education as "nothing but a preparation for life."[20] Hence, religion and education have to go hand in hand to fit the child "for the struggle of life" and the development of moral character."[21]

H.H. Walsh's The Christian Church in Canada[22] provides useful background information on the growth of the major Christian denominations in Canada. G.M. Weir's The Separate School Question in Canada[23] is a good summary of the separate school situation in Canada. In his section on Alberta he observed:

> In actual operation since 1913, however, the school system of Alberta has, in comparison with that of Saskatchewan, been singularly free from sectarian and political strife.[24]

He regarded the problem of nation-building as of paramount importance and suggested that there was no place for "racial animosities, religious prejudice, coercive attempts to secure educational uniformity"[25] in Canada. On the other hand, C.B. Sissons' Church and State in Canadian Education is also of interest, although his work is definitely unsympathetic to separate schools.[26]

The Papal document Affari Vos,[27] directed to the Bishops of Canada on December 8, 1897, was relevant because Leo XIII outlined some of the requirements of Catholic education. In this encyclical the Pope condemned non-religious schools and contended that without religion there could be no moral education. He further stated that Catholics should be instructed by Catholic teachers with textbooks and readers approved by the bishop. He suggested that Catholics in Manitoba should accept the concessions that had been granted them, but should continue to work for full satisfaction of their grievances. This document is important for it relates directly to the course of action taken later by Bishop Legal of Alberta in his negotiations with the Alberta Liberal Government.

Several theses provided general background information concerning educational developments in Alberta. I. Goresky[28] and H.T. Sparby[29] contributed needed insights into the early stages of educational growth in Alberta. R.S. Patterson[30] provided interesting documentation concerning relations between Premier Haultain and the Roman Catholic hierarchy during the territorial period. E.J. Hart[31]

has contributed to an understanding of the motivation and achievements of the French-speaking community of Edmonton prior to 1935 and R. Maclean's[32] historical survey of the Roman Catholic church in Edmonton has provided some insights into the contributions of Archbishops O'Leary and MacDonald.

Although R.B. Kistler[33] dealt specifically with cultural survival in Quebec, her thesis is useful because of the references made to the pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic theory of education:

> Education which is not inspired and filled with religion is not education at all. The Roman Catholic holds that true religion does not exist outside of the Catholic Church; therefore, education, to be truly sound, must of necessity be Roman Catholic education.[34]

She concluded that for Roman Catholics, education was the function of the family; the church had been chosen by the family to be its partner in the instruction of its children. In addition, the aim of education was not simply to provide facts but to give a philosophy of life and develop moral character and love of country.[35] From the point of view of Roman Catholic educational theory this thesis was one of the most relevant references.

L.A. Hochstein's[36] descriptive study of the development of Roman Catholic separate and public schools in Alberta prior to 1954 is concerned with providing a story of progress of Catholic schools in the face of serious obstacles. Like Kistler and Daly, she stressed the fact that, from the Catholic point of view, a Catholic philosophy of life and Catholic education prepared man not only for this world but also for his final end. This thesis is interesting as a source of information concerning Roman Catholic school growth in

Alberta.

T. Cashman's Edmonton's Catholic Schools[37] is a popular history that is worth reading. The style is lucid and it contains a wealth of information concerning Roman Catholic schooling in Edmonton. One of the flaws of the work is that it has no bibliography. In addition, it sheds little light on the theory of Roman Catholic schooling. However, it is relevant as an account of the struggle to maintain and improve the Edmonton separate schools, and as such is a fitting tribute to the efforts of the pioneers of Roman Catholic schooling in Edmonton.

It should be noted that, apart from Hochstein's and Rusak's unpublished Master's theses, Lupul's scholarly book and Cashman's popular history, there are few published or unpublished works available dealing with Catholic educational theory or practice for the period under study.

Pastoral Letters and Speeches

There are few pastoral letters pertaining to educational issues in the Archdiocese of Edmonton available for the years 1884-1960. This does not mean that the Archbishops of Edmonton were not concerned about education. In fact, they were deeply concerned and supported all actions that were taken to advance the cause of Roman Catholic education in the Edmonton Archdiocese, maintain the existing Catholic school rights and reinforce the theory of schooling. Some of the speeches that were given by the Archbishops and Bishops of

Alberta at conventions and other educational meetings provided more insight into the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy than the few pastoral letters on education that were issued. These were often published in the Western Catholic (from 1921) as well as in publications of the Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) from 1947.

The Western Catholic

The first issue of the Western Catholic was published on June 23, 1921, a result of the initiative of Archbishop O'Leary. The Western Catholic has remained the official voice of the Archdiocese from 1921 to the present. This weekly newspaper contained numerous articles and editorials relating to the nature of Catholic education and the need to provide Catholic schools for Catholic children. Full texts of speeches and radio addresses relevant to Catholic schooling were often printed in its pages. The Western Catholic was intended for Catholic homes and, therefore, carried reports concerning Catholic educational needs, problems and developments as a source of information to Catholic parents. It was also used as a forum by educators and decision makers who wished to extol the virtues of Catholic schooling and persuade Catholic parents that the education of their children should take place in Catholic schools.

Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) Bulletins and Pamphlets

ACEA documents were useful to this study. This association, formed in 1947, took an active part in promoting Catholic educational

theory. Its purpose was to improve the quality of Catholic education in the province of Alberta. Articles in the quarterly Bulletin of the association, as well as the speeches of the Bishops and Archbishops at its annual conventions, are an important source of information. So, too, are the other publications of the ACEA, such as texts of radio addresses and articles by members of the Catholic hierarchy.

The founders of the ACEA were trustees and other supporters of Catholic educational theory involved in educational activity in Alberta who regarded Pius XI's encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri as the major document on the Catholic theory of schooling. Because of their commitment to Catholic schooling and their philosophical orientation the publications of the ACEA are of great importance in understanding the purpose of Roman Catholic schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Minutes of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association and Catholic School Districts

This association had only been functioning as an independent body for two years before the end of the period of this study. The minutes of these first two years of the ACSTA were examined but provided no significant, new information.

Minutes of St. Albert Public (1911-1941, 1958-1960) and Edmonton (1916-1960), Red Deer (1920-1960), Vegreville (1948-1960), and Wainwright (1932-1960) Separate School Districts were reviewed. Attempts to gain access to the minutes of the Morinville Public

School District were unsuccessful.

Minutes were not available for the St. Albert Public and the Vegreville Separate School Districts for the entire period. From 1941 to 1957 St. Albert Public was part of the Sturgeon School Division. Therefore, minutes for those years were not available in St. Albert. With reference to Vegreville the minute books prior to 1948 could not be located. The Secretary-Treasurer of the district made several attempts to locate the minutes but he was not successful. However, the minutes that were reviewed did not provide pertinent information.

Interviews and Inquiries

Since pastoral letters and speeches by archbishops and other religious leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese were a major research area, access had to be gained to the Archdiocesan Archives. After the initial request was made to the Archbishop of Edmonton, the writer was advised to contact B. Holland, Archivist of the Roman Catholic Archbishop's Archives in Edmonton. Father Holland was contacted and he provided copies of relevant pastoral letters and arranged for the writer to have access to the volumes of the Western Catholic lodged in the Archdiocesan Archives. Father Holland also suggested that Justice J. Cormack and Father C. Kindervater be interviewed since they had been actively involved in supporting and defending Catholic educational interests for the last two decades of the period under study.

An interview was held with Justice J. Cormack, a layman, who had been actively involved in Roman Catholic educational affairs in the 1940's and 1950's. As one of the Commissioners of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, Mr. Cormack had submitted a Minority Report in 1959. The interview with him was useful and was followed by interviews with Father C. Kindervater, an Oblate. Father C. Kindervater had been actively involved with the ACEA and the ACSTA from their formation. He was elected president of the ACEA at the annual convention in 1954.[38] Kindervater was also one of the founding members of ACSTA. In 1958, he served as chairman of two ACSTA committees: the Teacher Training, Recruitment and Retention Committee and the Separate School Problems Committee.

The interviews with Father Kindervater were helpful. He not only shared his knowledge of the growth of Roman Catholic separate schools in Alberta but also provided access to his personal copies of the Bulletins and other publications of the ACEA and the Minutes of the ACSTA.

Organization of Material

The thesis of this study is that the theory of schooling developed by papal authorities in the nineteenth century was accepted unquestioningly by ultramontane, Oblate leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese between 1875 and 1920. This theory was reiterated by Pius XI in 1929 and the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton from 1920 continued to accept it even though Oblate archbishops no longer headed the church. Further, this thesis maintains that the theory

remained unchanged throughout the period under study.

The material will be organized in the following manner. In this chapter, an introduction to the topic, the purpose and scope of the study and a review of sources and pertinent literature has been presented. In chapter two the focus will be on selected external sources that may have influenced the development of the Roman Catholic theory of schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese. Among the source materials that will be examined are Leo XIII's Affari Vos, Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri (Christian Education of Youth) and various books and articles related to the theory of Catholic schooling in the United States and Canada. Chapter two will, therefore, provide a summary of selected external sources as they pertain to the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling. The historical background to Catholic schooling and the part played in this development by the Oblate congregation between 1875 and 1920 is central to an understanding of the Catholic theory of schooling. Therefore, in chapter three the role of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in the development of schooling in the North-West Territories (1875-1905) and Alberta (1905-1920) and their acceptance of the papal theory of Catholic schooling will be reviewed.

Chapter four will provide a review of the Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton between 1921 and 1946 to determine the nature of the Roman Catholic theory of schooling both before and after Pius XI's famous encyclical. This review will include an analysis of the major themes that formed the theory and that gave directives for the practice of Catholic schooling prior to

the formation of the ACEA. The next period, 1947 to 1960, discussed in chapter five is important; during that period the ACEA provided the focus for Catholic educational activity. This was an era when speeches and writings related to Catholic educational activity were at their peak in Edmonton. Therefore, in chapter five the period 1947 to 1960 will be examined and Roman Catholic statements and publications within Alberta analysed as they pertain to the theory of schooling. In chapter six concluding remarks, observations and recommendations for further study will be made.

Obviously, since the study begins in 1884 and ends in 1960, there will be differences in approach among the various Catholic leaders. However, it is expected that, despite changes in the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church in Edmonton during this period, the basic theory of Catholic schooling remained unchanged. Major changes in the Catholic philosophy of life and education were not evident until the post-Vatican II period.

Footnotes

[1]M.R. Lupul, The Roman Catholic Church and the North-West School Question: A Study in Church-State Relations in Western Canada, 1875-1905. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974, p. 22.

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

[3]R.J.A. Huel, "French-Speaking Bishops and the Cultural Mosaic in Western Canada," Religion and Society in the Prairie West. R. Allen (ed.), Canadian Plains Studies 3, Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1974, p. 62. Huel noted that McNally's appointment as Bishop of Calgary in 1912 was the first nomination of an English-speaking prelate in Western Canada.

[4]E. Shils, The Intellectuals and the Powers and Other Essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972, p. 23.

[5]Ibid.

[6]K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1936, pp. 55-56.

[7]P.S. Cohen, Modern Social Theory. London: Heinemann, 1968, p. 2. According to Cohen, "analytic" theories "state nothing about the real world," "normative" theories "elaborate a set of ideal types to which one may aspire" and "scientific" theories are "universal statements which assert causation." (Ibid.)

[8]Ibid.

[9]D.J. O'Connor, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957, p. 7.

[10]Ibid., p. 75.

[11]Ibid., pp. 105-106.

[12]J.P. Wynne, Theories of Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 29.

[13]Ibid., pp. 389-390. Wynne suggests that "the message from religion is one form of human experience that should not be rejected or accepted without critical examination." He further states that, while the supernatural-development theory may be indispensable to the Catholic church (and other religious groups), it cannot be considered as a general educational policy and program for a whole society that does not embrace one common religion. (Ibid.)

[14]E.J. Power, Evolution of Educational Doctrine: Major Educational Theorists of the Western World. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1969, pp. 372-373.

[15]Ibid., p. 392.

[16]H. Leduc, Hostility Unmasked: School Ordinance of 1892 of the North-West Territories and its Disastrous Results. Montreal: G. Beauchemin and Sons, 1896.

[17]Lupul, op. cit.

[18]S.T. Rusak, "Relations in Education between Bishop Legal and the Alberta Liberal Government, 1905-1920," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

[19]G.T. Daly, Catholic Problems in Western Canada. Toronto: MacMillan and Company of Canada Limited, 1921.

[20]Ibid., p. 163.

[21]Ibid., p. 176.

[22]H.H. Walsh, The Christian Church in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1956.

[23]G.M. Weir, The Separate School Question in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1934.

[24]Ibid., p. 96.

[25]Ibid., p. 240.

[26]C.B. Sissons, Church and State in Canadian Education. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959.

[27]Leo XIII, Affari Vos, December 8, 1897. Papal Teachings: Education, Selected and arranged by the Benedictine Monks of Solesines, Boston: St. Paul Press, 1960.

[28]I. Goresky, "The Beginning and Growth of the Alberta School System," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1944.

[29]H.T. Sparby, "A History of the Alberta School System to 1925," Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, Stanford University, 1958.

[30]R.S. Patterson, "F.W.G. Haultain and Education in the Early West," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

[31]E.J. Hart, "The History of the French-Speaking Community of Edmonton, 1795-1935," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

[32]R. Maclean, "The History of the Roman Catholic Church in Edmonton," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1958.

[33]R.B. Kistler, "Religion, Education and Language as Factors in French Canadian Cultural Survival," Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, New York University, 1947.

[34]Ibid., p. 92.

[35]Ibid., pp. 203-204.

[36]L.A. Hochstein, "Roman Catholic Separate and Public Schools in Alberta," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1954.

[37]T. Cashman, Edmonton's Catholic Schools: A Success Story. Edmonton: Edmonton Roman Catholic School District #7 (Jasper Printing Limited), 1977.

[38]ACEA Bulletin, Vol. 8, #1, September 20, 1954. Prior to becoming president, Father Kindervater had been actively involved in the work of the Association, particularly in the Grouard Vicariate where he had been instrumental in the formation of new Catholic separate school districts.

Chapter II

Ultramontanism and Schooling -- A General Perspective

Introduction

The theory of schooling of the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese (1884-1960) was closely related to the organizational structure of the Catholic church and to the historic tendencies of the Catholic church in Canada. According to K. Westhues the Catholic church conforms to the classical sociological definition of an organization:

> The Catholic Church is first of all an organization with a leader, a hierarchy of authority, a chain of command, goals, an ideology, functionaries, and all the other properties of organizations.[1]

Further, the church has functioned throughout its history on the principle of decentralization with each bishop in complete control of his diocese. Westhues suggests that Canadian bishops demonstrate remarkable compliance with Rome because of what he describes as value-integration:

> By this term is meant the existence among bishops of such commonality with respect to basic theology, basic values, and union with Rome, that acquiescence to Vatican wishes seldom requires the threat of sanctions; because of ideological agreement, decentralization is possible.[2]

The ideological agreement and compliance with Rome that Westhues describes is evident because the leaders of the church in Canada

were essentially ultramontanes.

Ultramontane beliefs were dominant among the Canadian Catholic hierarchy for much of the French regime in Canada. In The French-Canadians 1760-1967, Mason Wade noted that there was an initial struggle between gallicanism and ultramontanism in New France, but gallicanism soon lost the contest:

> . . . under the Jesuits and Bishop Laval the civil power came closer to being considered subject to the spiritual one in temporal matters, and the Pope's authority was regarded as supreme and not subject to the usages of a national church . . . Ever since French Canada has remained a stronghold of clericalism, and very conscious of its spiritual dependence upon the Holy See.[3]

J.M.S. Careless supports Mason Wade's position in his discussion of the role played by Laval as bishop of New France, (1659-1688).[4] In addition, Careless provides the following definition of an ultramontane church:

> An ultramontane Catholic Church was one that stressed absolute obedience to the Pope and Rome, denying the power of any national state to control or limit the Church.[5]

The leaders of the Catholic church in the Edmonton Archdiocese, like the other Canadian bishops, were of the ultramontane school. Because of this, the hierarchy in Edmonton were interested in and supportive of directives from the Vatican.

Because of the ultramontanism of the hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese, the theory of schooling developed in the Vatican was accepted unquestioningly in Edmonton. That theory of schooling was a general perspective or a directive doctrine based on a set of basic themes.

In this chapter papal documents that influenced the development of a Catholic theory of schooling will be examined. This will be followed by a survey of American Catholic educational writings to determine whether those writers espoused the same basic themes developed by the Vatican and reiterated in Edmonton. Finally, some Canadian Catholic materials will be reviewed to ascertain if the basic theory was the same as that enunciated by the papal authorities and adopted by American Catholic educational theorists.

Papal Directives

Roman Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton were not isolated from Rome's influence. In fact, they looked to Rome for guidance and support in their efforts to maintain and defend Catholic schooling in the Archdiocese. The theory of schooling espoused in Edmonton was a replication of the papal statements regarding schooling and demonstrated complete obedience and allegiance to the directives of the papal authorities.

As stated previously, the Catholic theory of schooling was based on themes laid down in doctrines postulated by the popes. Using the three sources the following themes will be explored in this chapter: the divine mission of the church to educate; the role of parents in schooling; Catholic schools for all Catholic children; the permeation ideal of Catholic schooling; the responsibilities and characteristics of Catholic teachers; and the relationship between intellectual and moral training.

There is a long history of papal interest in and writings concerning schooling and education. However, with the introduction of universal schooling in many countries in the nineteenth century, schooling became available to a larger segment of the school-age population and therefore became a phenomenon requiring greater papal attention. From about the middle of the nineteenth century popes began to expound on the necessity for religious education and to emphasize the need for Catholic children to be taught in Catholic schools.

One of the earliest criticisms of the secularization of education and reaffirmation of the divine mission of the church to educate was made by Pius IX in 1864, twenty years before the first School Ordinance of the North West Territories. In his apostolic letter Quum Non Sine, Pius IX stated:

> In all places, in every country where this pernicious plan to deprive the Church of her authority over schools is formulated and, worse still, put into effect, and where youth will consequently be exposed to the danger of losing their faith, it is the serious duty of the Church to make every effort not only to obtain for youth the essential instruction and Christian training, but even more so to warn the faithful and to make it clear that they cannot frequent such schools as are set up against the Catholic Church.[6]

Further, in Allocution to the German Literary Society (1873) he re-emphasized the divine educative mandate of the Church:

> To the Church He has said that she must go and teach all nations, that God's ministers must travel the length and breadth of the earth, there to preach the word of truth; baptizantes, they must administer the sacraments; they must edify by their word and example: instruction, I repeat, belongs entirely to the Church.[7]

Leo XIII, like his predecessor Pius IX, was convinced that the church had a divine mission to educate. In the encyclical Officio Sanctissimo (1887) he defined the role of the church in the office of religious teaching.[8] With reference to religious education in schools he suggested that church leaders should join with men of goodwill to ensure that religious education was retained in the schools:

> In this field, the labors of both the clergy and men of good will can be very effective -- on the one hand if they strive not only to prevent the banning of religious education from schools, but also to see that it continues to retain the importance it deserves and is entrusted to capable teachers of proved virtue; on the other hand, if they find other means to ensure this teaching for youth in a practical and an irreproachable manner.[9]

In Libertas (1888) Leo XIII elaborated on the role of the church as a teacher:

> She is therefore the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind, and in her dwells an inviolable right to teach men. Sustained by the truth received from her divine Founder, the Church has always sought to fulfill in a holy manner the mission entrusted to her by God.[10]

Leo XIII was definitely supportive of the divine mission of the church to educate and advocated action on the part of the clergy and lay Catholics to ensure that the religious aspect of schooling was not neglected.

The next pope to add to pronouncements regarding the role of the church in schooling was Benedict XV. He reiterated the views expressed earlier by Pius IX and Leo XIII in his apostolic letter to the Bishops of Canada in 1916 intended as advice to them on how they should resolve differences that existed between French and

English-speaking Catholics in Ontario over French language instruction in the schools. He reminded the hierarchy of their priorities with reference to schooling:

> The Catholic Bishops of your country ought to remember that it is of the greatest importance to avert placing the Catholic schools in a state of danger for any reason whatsoever; they should see to it that, though receiving a literary training, the children should learn also to preserve the Catholic Faith, to profess openly the Church's teaching and faithfully to obey its law. The love of children, the good of religion and the cause of Christ all demand this.[11]

Benedict XV died in 1922 and Pius XI ascended the papal throne the same year. Pius XI is venerated in Catholic educational circles for his encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri (Christian Education of Youth, 1929). However, that encyclical was not Pius XI's only statement concerning schooling. In his letter to the Bishops of Czechoslovakia on March 4, 1929 Pius reminded them that they should:

> not tire of insistently warning Catholic parents that it is their serious duty to train their children in holiness and that they have the right from the natural law freely to found Catholic schools or to demand, according to their means, that even in the public schools the faith of their children be preserved from all dangers and that their minds and wills be formed according to the rules of Christianity.[12]

Pius XI was definitely supportive of the role of the church in education emphasized by his predecessors. For example, in his letter to Cardinal Gasparri (May, 1929) he stated that "the full and perfect task of teaching belongs not to the State but to the Church."[13]

As previously stated, the name of Pius XI is venerated because of his encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri presented to the

Catholic world on December 31, 1929. According to Pius XI, a papal statement concerning education was necessary because of "this general condition of the times, this ceaseless agitation in various ways of the problem of educational rights and systems in different countries."[14] Pius XI drew heavily from the encyclicals of Leo XIII to support his position regarding the role of the church in education, the need for Catholic schools for all Catholic children and the division of government of the human race between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. Therefore, his encyclical was really a summation of Leo XIII's position in terms of Catholic educational theory. Essentially, his task was to summarize the main principles of Catholic education, enlighten the faithful concerning educational theory and point out how the principles of the theory could be applied practically.

Pius XI defined education as the process of "preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here below in order to attain the sublime goal for which he was created."[15] He added that the purpose of his encyclical was to provide:

> a clear and definite idea of Christian education in its essential aspects, viz., those who have the mission to educate, those who are the subjects to be educated, what are the necessary concomitant circumstances, what is the object and aim proper to Christian education according to God's established order in the economy of his Divine Providence.[16]

Pius defined the three societies into which man is born, namely the family (an imperfect society), the civil order and the church (perfect societies). He maintained that, as supernatural mother, the church had the right to decide what would help or harm Christian

education. Further, he reiterated the position of his predecessor regarding the divine mandate to teach that had been given to the church and added that the church was obliged to exercise this God-given right. It can be concluded, therefore, that papal authorities repeatedly maintained that the church had a divine mandate to educate and church leaders were obligated to do all in their power to fulfill this mission.

The role, duties and responsibilities of parents in the educative process was another basic theme of Catholic schooling theory. Papal authorities frequently emphasized the primary right of parents to choose the type of schools their children should attend. Further, the popes suggested that it was the duty of Catholic parents to ensure that their children were sent to Catholic schools. However, none of the papal documents examined gave Catholic parents the right to choose non-Catholic schooling for their children. In fact, these schools were condemned and, as far as the hierarchy was concerned, Catholics who sent their children to public schools without the permission of their bishop were failing in their duties as Christian parents.

Leo XIII felt that the family had an important role to play in the religious formation of youth. In his encyclical Nobillisima Gallorum Gens (1884) he stated:

> In regard to what primarily concerns domestic society, it is of the greatest importance that children born of Christian marriages be instructed early in the precepts of religion, and that the methods usually adopted to educate children in culture, go hand in hand with religious instruction.[17]

Leo's view was that parental responsibility for religious education started at birth and parents should ensure that their children received religious teaching from their earliest years.

In Sapientae Christianae (1890) Leo XIII defended the right of parents to decide how their children should be educated without interference from external sources:

> The family may be regarded as the cradle of civil society . . . Consequently, they who would break away from Christian discipline are working to corrupt family life and destroy it utterly, root and branch. From such an unholy purpose they are not deterred by the fact that they are inflicting a cruel outrage on parents, who have the right from nature to educate those whom they begot, a right to which is joined the duty of harmonizing instruction and education with the end for which they were given their children by the goodness of God. It is then incumbent upon parents to make every effort to resist attacks on this point and to vindicate at any cost the right to direct the education of their offspring, as is fitting, in a Christian manner; and first and foremost to keep them from schools where there is risk of their being imbued with the poison of impiety.[18]

The views expressed by Leo XIII in this encyclical clearly identify the family as the primary educator and emphasize that parents have the right to decide how their children should be educated. This definition of the role of the family/parents in education was important for it was part of the foundation on which the Catholic theory of schooling was built.

The pontiff repeated his views concerning the role of Catholic parents in the education of their children in Affari Vos, referred to earlier, directed to the Bishops of Canada, December 8, 1897:

> Therefore, when Catholics ask, and it is their duty to ask and demand, that the education given by teachers be in accordance with the religion of their children, they are using their right. And no greater injustice can be done to parents than to place them in the dilemma of either letting their children grow up in ignorance, or of putting them in surroundings which constitute a clear danger for the higher interests of their souls.[19]

Leo XIII was, therefore, a firm advocate of the primary right of parents to decide what type of education their children should receive, provided, of course, that they exercise that right to demand and support Catholic schooling.

Pius XI also supported the parent's right to choose the education his/her child should receive. In his Allocution to the students of Mondragone College in May, 1929 he contended:

> The State is not made to absorb, to engulf and to annihilate the individual and the family; that would be ridiculous, it would be contrary to nature in that the family precedes the State and society. The State cannot neglect the question of education but must contribute and procure what is necessary and sufficient to help, to cooperate and to perfect the efforts of the family, to correspond entirely with the desires of the father and mother and above all to respect the divine right of the Church.[20]

The primary right of parents in education was postulated by Leo XIII, supported by Pius XI and has remained one of the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling throughout this period. As stated earlier, the popes assumed that Catholic parents desired Catholic schooling for their children. Moreover, they indicated that Catholic parents should send their children to Catholic schools unless they were given episcopal permission to do otherwise. Clearly, as far as the popes were concerned, Catholic parents had the

primary right to decide how their children should be educated. This right was upheld by the hierarchy once parents recognized the divine mission of the church to educate and agreed that Catholic children should attend Catholic schools. Therefore, the educational rights of parents were supported as long as they accepted and obeyed the directives issued by the Catholic hierarchy.

The theme of Catholic schools for all Catholic children was constantly repeated by Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton and the United States throughout this period. Obviously, there were papal directives concerning this theme issued in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. These directives provided guidelines for action and pronouncements by the local hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

In 1875, Pius IX wrote a letter confirming instructions prepared by the Bishops of the United States, in which he advised:

> Every effort must, therefore, be made to set up Catholic schools where they do not yet exist and to increase the number of and improve the organization of those that already exist so that instruction and training on the same level as those of the public school may be ensured.[21]

By that time, the pope had obviously come to the realization that public schooling was going to be the "American way": -- that is non-sectarian, publicly-funded institutions. The role of Catholics was, therefore, to set up their own schools where religious education could be preserved.

The above quotation from Pius IX is relevant to subsequent developments in Canada and more specifically for the Archdiocese of Edmonton. The letter to the Bishops of the United States was

particularly significant because it dealt with the problem that would eventually confront Roman Catholic educational leaders in Edmonton with the advent of an elected government in the West.

Leo XIII supported this theme and added to the framework of the Catholic theory of schooling in the encyclical Militantis Ecclesiae (1897) when he advised that Catholics should not attend "mixed" schools but should have their own schools.[22] This position was supported by Benedict XV in his apostolic letter Communes Litteras to the Bishops of the United States in 1919.[23] Benedict was reinforcing the views concerning Catholic schooling for Catholic children that had been postulated by his predecessors, Pius IX and Leo XIII, in communications with the bishops of the United States, Canada and the rest of the Catholic world.

Like Benedict XV, Pius XI reaffirmed the need for Catholic schools for Catholic children that had been emphasized by Leo XIII during his papacy. In Divini Ilius Magistri Pius XI supported the motto "Catholic education in Catholic schools for all the Catholic youth" in countries with "mixed creeds."[24] This position was supported by his successor, Pius XII, who ascended the papal throne in 1939. In Le Sujet Qu'ont Choisi (1946) Pius XII stressed the importance of his predecessor's encyclical:

> Is it perhaps necessary to recall the code on the education of youth, constituted by the Encyclical, Divini ilius Magistri (a) In this, the respective positions of the family, of the Church and of the State are perfectly outlined. If it is really desired to educate youth in a way which will lead to a better future for the society, it is absolutely necessary to remember the impresciptible and natural rights of the Church and the family in this field.[25]

Nine years later in his letter to the Archbishop of Malines on the occasion of the National Congress of Belgium in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Divini Ilius Magistri,[26] Pius XII again emphasized the significance of his predecessor's pronouncements on Catholic schooling.

Pius XII, like his predecessors, Pius IX, Leo XIII, Benedict XV and Pius XI, was supportive of the ideal of Catholic schools for all Catholic children. All of these popes maintained that only Catholic schools could provide the religious education that was a necessary preparation for Catholic living. Therefore, they encouraged Catholics to set up their own schools regardless of any obstacles or difficulties.

The permeation ideal of Catholic schooling is an important theme that was regarded by the papal authorities as another basic tenet of Catholic educational theory. This theme is fundamental to an understanding of the Catholic theory of schooling because it is the one propagated by Catholic leaders in defence of their claim that public schools are unsuitable for Catholic children.

Leo XIII is credited with the papal statement that has been most often quoted in support of the permeation ideal of Catholic education. That statement is "religion must not be taught to youth only during certain hours, but the entire system of education must be permeated with Christian piety."[27]

Pius XI further reinforced the permeation ideal in the encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri. Pius described the Catholic school as an extension of the family and the church that was necessary for

the proper formation of all Catholic youth. Moreover, he insisted that a school with some religious instruction was unsuitable for Catholic children:

> [To be] a fit place for Catholic students . . . it is necessary that all the teaching and the whole organization of the school, its teachers, syllabus and text books of every kind, be regulated by the Christian spirit under the direction and maternal supervision of the Church, so that religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of youth's entire training; and this applies to every grade of school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate and the higher institutions of learning as well.[28]

In addition, the curriculum of these Catholic schools for Catholic youth would embrace the physical, spiritual, intellectual, moral, domestic and social aspects of life. According to Pius XI, education based on these principles would lead to the formation of the true and perfect Christian. This type of training could only be accomplished in a school in which the whole system was permeated by Christian piety.

Like his predecessors, Pius XII supported the permeation ideal. In fact, he openly criticized the restriction of religious instruction/education to determined time periods during the school day:

> An error which is very common restricts religious instruction and education to a determined period of time though with complete and wisely distributed programs. But the real Christian education exacts much more! it must be a continuous, permanent and progressive work; it must penetrate all teaching, even profane, penetrating right to the depths of the soul.[29]

The permeation ideal of Catholic schooling, defined by Leo XIII and supported by Pius XI and XII, is essential to an

understanding of demands for Catholic schooling. It is also closely connected to the Catholic philosophy of life and is a major theme of the Catholic theory of schooling. Because Catholics believe that education is a preparation for life as well as for the final end, the need for permeation can be defended on theological grounds. This was the position taken by the popes and, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, by the Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Teachers are an integral part of any educational system and the popes were aware of the need for suitably trained teachers capable of achieving the aims of Catholic schooling. Therefore, the responsibilities and characteristics of Catholic teachers was another theme that was of concern to the papacy. Having affirmed that the church had a divine mandate to educate, and that parents had the primary right in education, Catholic schools were needed for all Catholic children and these schools must be permeated by a Christian environment, the next question was what type of person was needed to teach in that atmosphere? Leo XIII summarized the papal position regarding the characteristics of Catholic teachers as follows:

> Civil prudence itself recommends that we leave to the Bishops and the clergy their part in the education and instruction of youth, and take care that men of indifferent religion or no religion at all, or openly hostile to the Church, should not be entrusted with the noble duty of teaching.[30]

Further, in Affari Vos he stated that, while careful attention to the programme of studies was necessary, the choice of teachers should also be given special attention:

> It is necessary, with your authority and the collaboration of those who direct educational institutions, that the whole program of studies be elaborated diligently and wisely and that special care be taken to see that men not endowed with all the necessary natural or acquired qualities be excluded from teaching.[31]

Leo's position regarding the need for careful selection and instruction of teachers was supported by his successors. For example, in Libenter Quidem (1921) Benedict XV informed the Catholic world that bishops had the right to establish rules for Catholic teachers to follow "with great attention in all that pertains to Catholic schools."[32] In addition, Pius XI provided further clarification of the kind of teacher that was desirable in Quando Quidem Probe (1922) directed to the Bishops of the United States:

> For your seminaries, colleges and schools, always and unceasingly prepare teachers who are equipped not only with a generally complete education but with one that is deeply penetrated with a really genuine Catholic spirit.[33]

Further, in Divini Ilius Magistri, Pius XI reiterated his position regarding teacher preparation:

> Perfect schools are not so much the result of good methods as of good teachers, teachers who are thoroughly prepared and well-grounded in the subject they have to teach; who possess the intellectual and moral qualifications required by their important office.[34]

Pius XI's successor, Pius XII served from 1939 to 1956. During his papacy Catholic teachers' associations and unions were being formed in many countries. For example, by the late 1940's there were at least three teachers' associations in Italy -- the Italian Association of Catholic Teachers, the Italian Catholic Union of Secondary Teaching and the Italian Catholic Elementary School

Teachers' Association.[35] In 1945, the idea of reviving the World Union of Catholic Teachers that had been originally founded in Vienna in 1912 was being discussed in Catholic circles. In 1950 a World Catholic Teachers' Union was formed with a membership of ten unions; by 1957, when the Third International Congress of the World Union of Catholic Teachers was held, the number of member unions had increased to forty.[36] As head of the Catholic church Pius XII frequently sent messages of encouragement and guidance to congresses of these associations. Obviously, the pope would utilize such opportunities to propound his views concerning the responsibilities and characteristics of Catholic teachers.

In a message to the Italian Association of Catholic Teachers (1948) Pius XII suggested that the best of programs would be of little use if the master was not suited to his task:

> The "ethical-religious conscience" in him is the first and indispensable element; but by itself, it is insufficient, and scholarship and capabilities are also needed . . . an adequate cultural and professional preparation, love of the child, dedication, ethical-religious preparation . . .[37]

-- all of these were necessary characteristics of the modern teacher. Pius XII elaborated on these in his Allocution for the Second Centenary of the Beatification of St. Joseph Calasanctius (1948). According to the pope educators should possess wisdom, tact, the ability to adapt their teaching to the intelligence and capacity of their pupils, devotion, love, enthusiasm and the desire to stimulate their pupils to work towards the spiritual life.[38]

Pius XII was also concerned about the example that teachers set for their pupils. He felt that it was the responsibility of the teacher to lead an exemplary life and be a model for his pupils:

> The teacher, that is, the educator who derives inspiration from paternity whose term or end is to generate other beings similar to himself, forms his pupils by the very example of his life, no less than by the rules and precepts . . . Even moral teaching, if not corroborated by deeds, will touch the spirit only superficially.[39]

According to Pius XII the teacher was responsible for moulding the intellect and will of the pupil. The Catholic teacher ought to be capable of creating a close relationship between his soul and that of the child, should devote himself to guiding the pupil to truth and virtue and should mould "the pupil's intellect and will so to fashion as best he can a being of human and Christian perfection."[40] On another occasion Pius XII reminded teachers that they had other responsibilities to their pupils besides providing them with academic training:

> Give them a degree of learning that is in proportion to their young age; prepare them for the later phases of their education; inspire them with a holy love for the family and the nation. But, above all else, form them with a religious and moral training that is healthy, solid, clear and well-founded, a formation that will produce good sons of the family, good citizens of the nation and good members of the Church.[41]

As far as the papacy was concerned, Catholic teachers were expected to be role models, to mould the intellect and will of their students by providing them with appropriate academic training as well as religious/moral education. Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII all expressed similar views concerning the characteristics Catholic

teachers should possess and the responsibilities of the teaching office.

The balance that should be maintained between intellectual and moral/religious training was another theme explored by Catholic educational authorities. There are no records of comments by Pius IX, Leo XIII and Benedict XV on this theme. Their educational pronouncements were mainly confined to the role of the church in schooling, the natural right of parents to choose the education their children should have, the permeation ideal of Catholic schooling and the need for Catholic schools for Catholic children. Since the above were the main issues discussed during their terms of office they concentrated on providing the Catholic world with the church's position regarding those themes.

Pius XI clarified the position of the Catholic church regarding scientific learning in the apostolic letter Con Vivo Compiacimento (1922) directed to Father Gemelli of the University of the Sacred Heart in Milan.[42] Again, in Quando Quidem Probe (1922) he stated that the kind of education needed for the solid formation of youth was "an education that has at the root of its scientific instruction religion and virtue, the two essentials that the Church unceasingly recommends in numerous ways."[43] He added that it was imperative that youth should have an equal liking for learning and religious devotion. In other words, a balance between academic learning and religious instruction was necessary for the proper formation of Catholic youth.

Pius XI expanded his views concerning the relationship between intellectual and moral training in the encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri. According to the pontiff since Christian education was concerned with the whole of human life the curriculum of Catholic schools for Catholic youth should embrace "physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social" aspects of life.[44] He felt that education based on these principles would lead to the formation of the true and perfect Christian.

Pius XII served as pope during a trying period of world history. He ascended the papal throne on the eve of the Second World War and remained pontiff throughout the turbulent times that followed the end of the war. In addition, because of technological advances, values and lifestyles were changing. For Pius XII the modern world was beset with problems of restlessness, pressures, striving for success at all costs and moral instability that affected youth through films, books and pictures. Catholic schools had to perform the special duty of providing an education that would lead to the formation of a man of "clear, sure and profound convictions who can control himself and preserve and defend his human and Christian dignity"[45] despite the temptation and pressures of daily life. He further emphasized that:

> what characterizes the true Christian education is that it tends toward the complete formation of the child, of the adolescent in order to make of him a man, a citizen, an integral and well-balanced Catholic, rather than a pretentious erudite.[46]

Pius XII recognized that technological changes in the world, with the accompanying improved standard of living and higher stress

levels, were affecting Catholics as they were affecting the rest of the population in the industrialized world. A summary of the pope's response to this development is contained in his Letter to the Third International Congress of the World Union of Catholic Teachers held in August, 1957:

> Technology is beginning to change the psychic structure of man, but it must not be permitted to change the Catholic ideal of education. . . . It is man in the age of technology who stands most in need of that consistent and uniform education based on absolute truth and on God as the center of existence, an education which only Christian faith and the Catholic Church can provide.[47]

Obviously Pius XII was convinced that a proper balance between technological and moral education could only be achieved in a Catholic school.

Pius XII and his predecessors, Pius IX, Leo XIII, Benedict XV and Pius XI, provided the framework for the Catholic theory of schooling by reminding Catholics of the views of the church regarding the divine educative mission of the church, the primary educational rights of parents, the need for Catholic schools for Catholic children and the permeation ideal. The responsibilities and characteristics of teachers and the relationship between intellectual and moral training were addressed specifically by Pius XI and XII because these issues came to the forefront during their pontificates. The increasing numbers of lay teachers being employed in Catholic schools necessitated directives concerning the role of teachers while technological development and the accompanying pressures of modern living caused conflicts to arise over the issue of intellectual

versus moral education. It is apparent that the popes were paying attention to changes in society and were keeping these changes in mind as they prepared their messages for the Catholic world or more specifically, Catholic educational leaders.

Interpretation and Application of Papal Directives in the United States

It is apparent that the popes were the prime Catholic educators and what they said influenced and directed the thinking of individuals directly or indirectly involved in Catholic schooling. Of the papal documents discussed Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri was most often quoted by American Catholic educational writers. In addition, American Catholic educators were keenly interested in the papal documents on education because they needed the support and direction of the Holy See in their efforts to establish and maintain Catholic schools for all Catholic children. In this section a representative sample of American Catholic writers will be reviewed.

The importance accorded to Pius XI's encyclical by Catholic educational writers was summarized by E.B. Jordan in a lecture presented during the summer session (1939) at the Catholic University of America:

> First in importance is the masterful Encyclical of Pope Pius XI . . . in which the modern world has been given an authoritative presentation of the Church's position on the more important of the controversial points in educational theory and practice. Thus the Encyclical may be said to constitute a modern Charter of Catholic Education, taking precedence over but by no means supplanting the works of other writers on the subject. Here, as in other instances, the

> intention of the Holy See was to direct, not to suppress, the activities of Catholic educators. Hence the theory of education expounded in the Encyclical must be supplemented by a study of the works produced by other Catholic writers who have specialized in the field of education.[48]

However, it should be noted that Pius XI was merely reiterating the views expressed by Leo XIII and his predecessors. As W.J. McGucken observed in The Catholic Way in Education (1934) "there is no new doctrine enunciated in the encyclical; it is merely re-emphasizing the century-old Catholic doctrine and tradition."[49]

Catholic educational history in the United States differs somewhat from that of Canada. For example, there was no provision for publicly funded religious schools in the United States as there was in several Canadian provinces. American Catholic educational leaders had to establish parochial schools supported by the Catholic population if they wished to pursue the goal of Catholic schools for Catholic children. The first Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) urged Americans to erect parochial schools.[50] The theme of the third Baltimore Council (1884) was the "Education of Catholic Youth." At that Council members had "urged erection of parochial schools and a committee was set up to arrange for the creation of a Catholic University."[51] The goal of this particular Council was every Catholic child in a Catholic school. The Baltimore councils were, therefore, central to the development of Catholic schooling in America.

In a review of Redden and Ryan's A Catholic Philosophy of Education (1942), B.J. Bishop stated:

> Catholic philosophy of education has not always been clearly stated in manuals and treatises on Catholic education, yet it has always been the basis of Catholic instruction in the school and in the home. The practice of Catholic philosophy has been more universal than the theory. The first rather full treatment of Catholic philosophy and education in English was the translation of Dr. De Hovre's Essai de Philosophie Pedagogique by Father Jordan of the Catholic University in 1930. However, it was not until the later 30's that a number of Catholic writers busied themselves in presenting the philosophy of the educational system that is Catholic heritage.[52]

It follows that after the Councils of Baltimore, American Catholic religious and educational leaders were involved in establishing more parochial schools rather than theorizing about the virtues of Catholic schooling.

In the introduction to his translation of F. De Hovre's Essai de Philosophie Pedagogique, E.B. Jordan wrote that "in the field of education, perhaps more than anywhere else, theories are determined by the concept of life that one holds."[53] It is in this context that Catholic schooling and the works of Catholic educational theorists have to be viewed. Catholic education embraces the Catholic philosophy of life. According to De Hovre, because education deals with human problems and interests as well as man's soul, religion and schooling cannot be separated:

> Education deals with the soul of man; its object is his complete transformation from a child of the flesh to a child of God. It aims to open his mind to the vision of truth, to clarify his sense of values, to adjust him to the things of eternity as well as the things of time, to make him a faithful member of the divine society which Christ established, to lead him to God.[54]

Since the Catholic viewpoint on schooling was inextricably bound to

beliefs concerning God and the church it is not surprising that the church's claim that it had the divine mission to educate was accepted unquestioningly by Catholics.

The divine mission of the church to educate was one of the recurring themes of the Catholic theory of schooling in the United States. In The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System of the United States (1912) J.A. Burns noted that "since education . . . is essentially a spiritual function the control of the education of her own children rests ultimately with the church."[55] J.D. Redden and F.A. Ryan (A Catholic Philosophy of Education, 1942) suggested that the church "possesses the first title to education, the supreme authority to teach"[56] -- a right which has been assigned by God Himself. In Catholic Viewpoint on Education (1959) N.G. McCluskey explained that the Catholic conception of life and complete faith in the church are inseparable:

> A Catholic starts with an assumption that religion is the central concern of human existence. A Catholic believes that his purpose in life is to learn to live in such a way as to prepare himself for an immortal supernatural destiny. He believes further that God has given him the Church, a visible society functioning in the temporal world, in order to assist him to attain an eternal objective which transcends this world.[57]

Further, Catholics believe that "Christ entrusted to the Apostles and their episcopal successors the office of teaching His revelation. The bishops, accordingly, have a pastoral mandate which all Catholics acknowledge."[58] According to McCluskey, Catholic parents recognize the divine authority of the church in education and are,

therefore, willing to follow its teachings and regulations regarding the education of their offspring. This position was reiterated by P.H. Hallett in What is a Catholic? (1961).[59] Therefore, American Catholic educational writers were in agreement with the papal educational authorities regarding the divine educational mission of the church.

Another basic theme of the Catholic theory of schooling was the responsibilities and duties of parents regarding schooling. The papal authorities maintained that parents had the primary right to educate. However, they limited this right by insisting that it could only be exercised correctly if the dictates of the church regarding the type of school Catholic children should attend were obeyed. The basic principles of parental responsibilities outlined by the popes were summarized in Canon 1113 of the Revised Code of Canon Law (1919).[60] As will be seen American Catholic educational authorities were supportive of the papal position regarding parental rights and responsibilities.

At the First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) the bishops reminded parents of their responsibilities regarding schooling:

> To you, Christian parents, God has committed these His children, whom He permits you to regard as yours; . . . give your children a Christian education, that is an education based on religious principles, accompanied by religious practices and always subordinate to religious influence.[61]

J.A. Burns staunchly supported the educational rights of parents in his book referred to earlier. Further, he quoted from an article

by Cardinal H.E. Manning of England in support of his position. Manning had supported parental rights regarding education and had outlined their educational duties in that article published in The Forum of March 1889.[62]

Redden and Ryan endorsed the positions of Leo XIII and Pius XI regarding parental educational rights and duties:

> By the natural law, parents have the obligation of rearing, nourishing, and educating their children . . . Moreover, this primary, inalienable right of the family to educate includes not only the right to impart instruction, but also to determine the kind and manner of instruction. Since formal instruction is an integral part of the process of education, parents have the right and duty to provide such instruction for their children, or to secure it from proper and authoritative sources.[63]

They quoted from Divini Ilius Magistri (Pius XI) and Sapientae Christianae (Leo XIII) in support of their position regarding the educational rights and responsibilities of parents. Therefore, it can be concluded that Redden and Ryan had carefully studied and were influenced by the papal encyclicals regarding the roles of the church and the family, the purpose and requirements of Catholic schooling and the roles of the various educational agencies responsible for delivering the service.

McCluskey also endorsed the papal position regarding parental rights:

> Control over the education of their children belongs primarily to parents, since those who bring children into this world must assume the primary responsibility for their proper rearing and schooling. The duty of parents certainly includes seeing that their children receive proper instruction for both their temporal and spiritual destinies.[64]

Like Redden and Ryan, McCluskey utilized Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri to support his position. It is evident, therefore, that American Catholic religious and lay educators endorsed the papal pronouncements regarding the roles of parents and the church in the education of Catholic youth.

P.H. Hallett also referred to Divini Ilius Magistri in his discussion of parental educational rights and responsibilities. He reiterated that parents had the primary right to decide what type of education their children should have and suggested that the Oregon Supreme Court decision of June 22, 1925 which upheld parental educational rights was an important decision for Catholic parents.[65]

Like the papal authorities, American Catholic religious and lay spokesmen were supportive of the primary right of parents to decide how their offspring should be educated. However, it should be noted that these rights were upheld only if Catholic parents accepted that the church had a divine mission to educate and undertook to send their children to Catholic schools wherever these were available. As far as the hierarchy was concerned parents who failed to do this were not meeting their responsibilities as Catholic parents and were depriving their children of their God-given right to schooling in a Catholic environment. This was clearly enunciated in Decree IV of the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore (1884):

> IV That all Catholic parents are bound to send their children to the parish school, unless it is evident that a sufficient training in religion is given either in their own homes, or in other Catholic schools; or when because of a sufficient reason, and

> approved by the bishop, with all due precautions and safeguards, it is licit to send them to other schools. What constitutes a Catholic school is left to the decision of the bishop.66

This statement by the bishops was definitely influenced by the papal directives. Clearly, Catholic parents were expected to send their children to Catholic schools unless they were given permission to do otherwise by their bishop.

The theme of Catholic schooling for all Catholic children, one of the papal directives regarding schooling, became the most famous slogan of the American Catholic educational movement. The particularistic nature of American Catholic schooling discussed earlier was responsible for the importance of this theme. Because Catholic schooling was a private undertaking of the church and its supporters, expansion and survival were closely allied. In discussing the triumphalism of the Catholic church in America, V.P. Lannie noted that:

> Triumphalism was all about: from one diocese to a score of dioceses; from one church to a multiplicity of churches; from one schoolhouse to thousands of schools; from a handful of priests to seminaries overflowing with clerical candidates; from insufficient teaching personnel to a multitude of religious men and women . . . The progress of Catholic schools in America was as triumphant a venture as that of the church; and, as importantly, these schools were as totally American as the public schools.67

McCluskey documented the historical growth of American Catholic schooling in Catholic Education in America (1964). He suggested that since the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore a particular ideal of Catholic education has been emphasized in the United States -- "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school."

In reviewing the growth of Catholic schools since that ideal was popularized, McCluskey found that:

> At the turn of the century, there were 854,523 pupils in Catholic schools, and by 1920, this number had more than doubled to 1.8 million . . . Since World War II Catholic schools have grown at three times the rate of the public schools . . . The current enrollment in Catholic schools is 5.5 million, or 14 percent of the nation's total elementary -- and secondary -- school population.68

The basis for the theme "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school" can be found in the pastoral statement issued by the bishops at the Third Plenary Council:

> Two objects, therefore, dear brethren, we have in view, to multiply our schools, and to perfect them. We must multiply them, till every Catholic child in the land shall have within its reach the means of education. There is still much to do ere this be attained. There are still thousands of Catholic children in the United States deprived of the benefit of a Catholic school. Pastors and parents should not rest till this defect be remedied.69

It can be concluded that the bishops of the United States fully supported the papal directives concerning Catholic schooling for Catholic children and had constantly urged their flock to strive towards the attainment of that ideal.

Redden and Ryan also espoused the ideal of every Catholic child in a Catholic school.[70] They maintained that, since the Catholic philosophy of life was closely connected to its philosophy of education, public schools were unsuitable as educational agencies for Catholic children. In Catholic Education in a Changing World (1967) G.N. Shuster suggested that the growth of Catholic schools in America was influenced by parental demands for Catholic

education for their children. He added that, after the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore:

> The slogan now became: "Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School." No one can tell on the basis of the available evidence just how strongly lay public opinion supported what was in essence a hierarchical demand, but at least one can assert without fear of being in error that in very many instances when a parochial school was built the problem was not how to attract pupils but how to keep the enrollment within bounds.[71]

The theme of "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school" is essential to an understanding of the American Catholic educational movement. It had its origins in the Vatican but was endorsed and adopted as an ideal by the American Catholic hierarchy. As Shuster pointed out, it is difficult to determine how much support the hierarchy received from lay Catholics in their quest to attain this objective. However, from the growth of Catholic schooling described by McCluskey, it can be concluded that many Catholic parents in America wanted their children to attend Catholic schools.

Another major theme of the Catholic theory of schooling was the permeation system of Catholic education. This theme, based on a papal directive initially propagated by Leo XIII, was reiterated by his successors. American Catholics, like their counterparts in Canada, used this theme to justify their desire for Catholic schools. As early as 1876, J.O. Murray discussed the permeation system of Catholic schooling in A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States. Murray defined this system in the following way:

> Religion mingles with the whole course of the exercises and imparts her loving benediction while she cheers the young hearts up the hill of knowledge. Thus, the pupils learn 'to keep God in their minds all the days of their lives' . . . Religion and science with heavenly harmony dwell together; and the young mind sees no conflict between them, because there can be none. The boy reveres the one, he loves the other. He knows they are both from God. He does not feel that his Faith is an intruder in the schoolroom. Science enlightens it; Religion sanctifies it. Religious teaching is interwoven with the lessons in secular knowledge as the golden threads which give permanent value which they enrich and beautify. Youth are thus trained up in the way they should go, and in old age they will not depart from it.[72]

Murray's definition was an endorsement of the permeation system of Catholic schooling -- that a total religious environment was necessary to effective Catholic schooling.

In The Catholic Way in Education (1934) W.J. McGucken provided further support for permeation:

> The class in religion will be reinforced not merely by the instruction in the other classes but by the whole life of the school in curricular and extra-curricular activity -- all giving the Catholic philosophy of life whose Alpha and Omega is Christ, the Son of God.[73]

Even though over half a century had elapsed since Murray's statement, the permeation system was still one of the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling. Further endorsement of permeation was provided by Redden and Ryan:

> Religious education is the primary function, the raison d'etre of the Catholic school . . . Religion must, of necessity, permeate all life and education. Its teachings constitute the very core and foundation upon which all education for the true, the good and the beautiful must be founded . . . Religion, therefore, must be the core-curriculum around which revolve all other branches of learning.[74]

Like Murray and McGucken, Redden and Ryan fully endorsed the hierarchical position on permeation.

W. Bless, an American Catholic cleric, also regarded permeation as an essential element of Catholic schooling. In "The Role of the School in the Religious Formation of Youth" (1957) he reminded teachers of Pius XI's declaration that a school could not be considered Catholic "unless the whole of the teaching, the teachers, the curricula and textbooks are impregnated with the Catholic spirit."[75] McCluskey summarized the Catholic perspective of the function of the school:

> The function of the Catholic school is not merely to teach the formulas of the Catholic religion, but, as Father George Bull of Fordham University once said "to impart in a thousand ways, which defy formularization, the Catholic attitude towards life as a whole."[76]

The papal directive on the permeation ideal of Catholic schooling, promulgated by Leo XIII and later endorsed by Pius XI, was supported by both clerical and lay educational leaders in the United States. Like the slogan "Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School," permeation remained an ideal of Catholic schooling in America throughout the period of this study.

Another theme of the Catholic theory of schooling that was covered by papal directives in the period under study was the responsibilities and characteristics of Catholic teachers. From the sources examined it is apparent that the American Catholic educational hierarchy was primarily concerned with justifying the need for Catholic schools and providing these institutions wherever

and whenever possible. Because of their particular interests, they were preoccupied with the themes outlining the divine mission of the church, the responsibilities of parents, the permeation system and the ideal of Catholic schools for Catholic children. Certainly Catholic school promoters would have been concerned about the characteristics and responsibilities of teachers.

R.J. Bandas, Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Catechetics at St. Paul's seminary in the 1920's and 1930's, expressed concern over the characteristics of religious teachers in Religion: Teaching and Practice (1939). He contended that teachers in religious schools, particularly those responsible for religious education, were entrusted with the task of training the mind and fashioning the heart and character of youth. Therefore, teachers of religion had to be men and women of exemplary character who practised what they preached:

> A teacher who does not do what he teaches, pulls down with one hand what he builds up with the other. The religious instruction itself becomes disagreeable to him, since his words are a constant reproach to his conduct. If, on the other hand, the catechist's heart is gripped with enthusiasm for the ideals of religion, this inward fire will soon become manifest and inspire the hearts of children.[77]

Redden and Ryan found that new conceptions of the learning process and the learner led to broader conceptions of the place and function of the teacher as well as innovations in teacher-training. However, they emphasized that the teacher had to continue to play an authoritative role for, even when pupils were engaged in group activity, they needed mature guidance and direction:

> The word "teacher" connotes, in the Catholic sense, one who has authority over others for the purpose of instructing them in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and ideals consonant with their true nature, ultimate end, and highest good. This authority does not imply tyrannical or dominating control; but, rather, that dynamic and wholesome influence and wholesome guidance of the mature mind over the immature . . . The teacher's authority is derived from a prior, justly constituted authority, which, in its turn, has its source and sanction from God . . . The teacher has a responsibility to God, to the pupils, and to the particular society, family, state or church which authorizes him to teach.[78]

Redden and Ryan utilized Divini Ilius Magistri to support their insistence that teacher authority was a necessity. Since their work was one of the major sources of Catholic educational philosophy in the United States, it can be concluded that the American Catholic school promoters were influenced by pronouncements from the Vatican regarding the responsibilities and characteristics of teachers. However, this theme was not prominent in their writings because they were preoccupied with other issues that were directly related to the establishment and growth of Catholic schools.

Another theme of Catholic schooling enunciated by the popes and endorsed by American Catholics was the relationship between intellectual and moral/religious training. McGucken summarized the Catholic position regarding the role of religion in education:

> Education, if it is a life or even a preparation for life, must prepare for all of that life. For religion enters into every nook and cranny of life. . . . Education, then, unless it chooses to neglect a large and the most important part of life, must necessarily include training in religion, both in belief and conduct.[79]

The Catholic viewpoint regarding the relationship that should exist between religion and education was influenced by the Catholic philosophy of life.[80] In view of this McGucken favoured a blending of religious and intellectual pursuits since "education is an intellectual process [that] has to do with the opening of the windows of the human mind, the enrichment and ennobling of the human soul."[81] He further contended that philosophy and science only give partial answers to the "world riddle." Religion was needed to complete the picture:

> For religion deals with ideas, facts, things, words; it runs through all of life; it is life itself . . . If religion be banned from liberal education, you have not merely an incomplete education, you have a maimed and distorted education, an etre manque.[82]

The views expressed by McGucken were shared by other Catholic spokesmen including J. Maritain. Maritain was an important Catholic thinker whose book, Education at the Crossroads (1943) based on his Terry lectures at Yale University, became a standard reference text in Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. Maritain maintained that, if the education of man is to be well-grounded, it has to be based upon the Christian idea of man. In view of this, educators should respect the soul as well as the body of the child:

> Christian education . . . tries to develop as far as possible natural energies and virtues, both intellectual and moral . . . In the first place Christian education involves all those requirements which characterize in general any genuine education truly aiming at helping a child or man attain his full formation or his completeness as a man. In the second place, Christian education, insofar as it is precisely Christian, has a number of specific requirements, dependent on the fact that the young man with whom it is concerned is a Christian and must be prepared to lead his adult life as a Christian.[83]

Although Maritain clearly indicated that moral/religious education should be combined with intellectual pursuits, he did not specify how this training would fit into the school system. However, he suggested that theological studies should be undertaken at the college and university level.

Further support for the blending of intellectual and religious education was provided by Sister A. Virginia in "The Cruel Choice Facing Catholic Education." (1962):

> Catholic education is religious education; it is also intellectual education, social education, education which touches man at every point -- religious, academic, psychological, social, cultural, physical.[84]

Therefore, for Catholics education without religion was incomplete; hence, it was necessary for intellectual pursuits and religious/moral training to be combined in Catholic schools.

Redden and Ryan provided detailed analysis of the importance of moral and religious training to Catholic schooling. They described the naturalistic tendency to separate moral and religious education as an "insufficient interpretation of the ideal" and insisted that, for Catholics, religious and moral education could not be separated. In fact, Catholic schools had the obligation to provide an education that catered to the intellectual, religious and moral needs of their pupils.[85]

It is evident that Catholic educational leaders in the United States fully endorsed papal pronouncements concerning the relationship that should exist between intellectual pursuits and moral/religious education in Catholic schools. This was one of the

themes of Catholic educational theory utilized by Catholics to explain the difference between Catholic and neutral schools. The American Catholic writers discussed here provided Catholic religious and lay school promoters with arguments that favoured the maintenance of Catholic schooling in a largely secular society. The survival and growth of Catholic schooling throughout this period was definitely encouraged by these spokesmen who read, interpreted and endorsed the papal directives on Catholic schooling.

From the material presented in this section, it can be concluded that American Catholic educational leaders were influenced by papal directives on schooling. Moreover, they used these directives to support their call for more Catholic schools for Catholic children. Because American Catholic leaders were "absolutely loyal to Rome and to the Catholic faith in its traditional entirety,"[86] they looked to Rome for guidance and obeyed the dictates of the Vatican in educational and other matters. As outlined above, they not only received the guidance they sought, but also utilized the directives to justify their insistence that Catholic schooling should be maintained despite general American hostility to religious schools. Further, they frequently referred to and endorsed the encyclicals on education that had been presented by Leo XIII and Pius XI. As G.B. Phelan remarked in "The Problems of Communication between Catholic and non-Catholic Educators and Philosophers" (1957):

> Papal encyclicals, such as those on Christian Philosophy by Pope Leo XIII and on Christian Education of Youth of Pope Pius XI, are authoritative documents for all

> Catholics. It is this common allegiance to definite principles that justifies the grouping together of educators and philosophers, among whom many differences of opinion may prevail, under the general rubric of Catholic educators and Catholic philosophers.[87]

The fact that Catholic schooling survived and developed in America is ample proof of the success of the undertaking to provide Catholic schools wherever possible. In addition, the American Catholic position regarding what Catholic schooling entailed did not change throughout this period. In fact, as McCluskey observed, the American Catholic position remained unchanged for over a century:

> Since the time of Archbishop Hughes of New York and the controversial 1840's, the Catholic position on education has remained substantially the same. There has always been insistence on these points: secular education must be integrated with religious education; a weekly catechism lesson in Sunday school is an inadequate substitute; attendance at public schools, because of a Protestant and secularist orientation, can prove spiritually harmful for Catholic children; ideally Catholic children should be educated in Catholic schools.[88]

Canadian Interpretations of Papal Schooling Directives

There are few English Canadian sources that discuss the theoretical foundations of Catholic schooling. However, despite the paucity of materials, the theory that emerged was the same as that espoused by the popes and the American Catholic hierarchy. Like their American counterparts, the Canadian Catholic hierarchy was absolutely loyal to the popes; hence papal directives were accepted unquestioningly. The Canadian Catholic school situation was considerably different from the American, but the theory of schooling

was the same given the papal orientation of both hierarchies. The main difference between American and Canadian Catholic schooling was that in the United States Catholic education was a private enterprise whereas in Canada there could be public, separate or private Catholic schools.

The position of the nineteenth century English Canadian hierarchy regarding the Catholic theory of schooling has been adequately summarized in Historical Sketch of the Separate Schools of Ontario and Minority Report (1950). This historical sketch and minority report was prepared by the Catholic commissioners of the Ontario Royal Commission on Education. The Catholic members of the Commission did not append their signatures to the majority report since they disagreed with some of the majority findings. As background to their minority position, they reviewed schooling in Upper Canada in the 1850's and found that the basic themes of Catholic schooling had been developed and were in operation in Canada more than sixty years before Pius XI endorsed the views of his predecessors in Divini Ilius Magistri. At a general meeting of Catholics in Toronto held on May 17, 1852 the following resolution had been unanimously accepted:

> As Catholics we cannot sanction any system of Common School Education for the youth of our Community, but one which will at all times, secure the full need of religious instruction under the legitimate Ecclesiastical Authority of our Church.89

It is apparent that the nineteenth century Catholic leaders in Toronto supported the divine mission of the church to educate and felt that secular authorities should respect that right. H. Leduc

reiterated the position of the hierarchy on this matter in Hostility Unmasked: School Ordinance of 1892 of the North-West Territories and its Disastrous Consequences (1896). Leduc urged Catholics in the Territories to "protest against the injustice" of the 1892 School Ordinance which was intended to deprive the Catholic church of "her influence in Catholic education."[90] G.T. Daly also endorsed the Catholic position regarding the divine mandate of the church in Catholic Problems in Western Canada (1921). In addition, French-Canadian Catholic acceptance of this theme is documented in R.B. Kistler's doctoral dissertation (1949). Kistler noted that in Quebec "all phases of education are under the direction of the church, which claims a divine mission to teach."[91] The educative mission of the Catholic church was, therefore, a basic theme of Canadian Catholic schooling and received full support from the Catholic hierarchy.

The responsibilities, duties and rights of parents regarding education was another basic theme of the Catholic theory of schooling. The authors of the historical sketch of Catholic education in Ontario found that, while Catholic leaders maintained that it was the duty of parents to ensure that their children received a proper education, they also insisted that only Catholic schools could provide the right kind of education.[92] The Bishops of the First Plenary Council of Quebec (1909) also supported parental educational rights. In a Pastoral Letter, issued at the end of the Council, they commented on parental educational duties and responsibilities:

> The training of children is of a truth the supreme duty, even as it is the great glory, of parents. Nature, as well as religion, places this responsibility upon them and the welfare of society requires that they discharge it with intelligence and devotion.[93]

G.T. Daly also endorsed the primary right of parents to decide how their offspring should be educated in his book referred to earlier. He summarized their rights as follows:

> As by the supreme and sacred right of conscience man is free to give to his life its moral direction, so also does the same principle apply to the education of a child for whose conscience, as for whose life the parent is responsible. The moral right of the parent, which is one with that of the child in that period of life is fundamental. It constitutes the bed-rock on which rest all other rights in matters of education.[94]

Daly felt that the school's mission was to supplement the work of the home. In addition, the State did not have the right to interfere with the parents' freedom to determine the kind of education a child should have:

> The freedom of education means the right of a parent to give to his offspring an education in harmony with his concept of life, within the dictates of his conscience. As education is nothing but a preparation for life its theory goes hand in hand with the theory of life.[95]

Therefore, Daly not only supported the parent's right to choose the type of education a child should have, but also maintained that the state should not be allowed to infringe on this right.

Kistler found that French Canadian educational philosophers also endorsed the principle of parental rights in education:

> The cardinal principle of French Canadian educational philosophy is that education is, primarily, a function of the family, which has, therefore, the right to entrust the instruction of its offspring to any agency desired.[96]

It can be concluded, therefore, that Vatican pronouncements regarding parental educational rights and responsibilities were fully endorsed by the Canadian Catholic hierarchy.

The theme -- Catholic schooling for all Catholic children -- was also endorsed by the bishops of the First Plenary Council of Quebec. They supported Leo XIII's position, as outlined in Affari Vos, which could be described as the universal Catholic viewpoint regarding attendance at Catholic schools:

> Wherever Catholic schools are to be found, Catholics are obliged in conscience to send their children to them. When they are wanting we ask pastors and people to make every effort to establish them, . . . let them use every means in their power even at the cost of the greatest sacrifices, to secure for their children the benefits of an education in conformity with their faith.[97]

The authors of the historical sketch of education in Ontario provided an adequate summary of the views of Canadian Catholic leaders on this theme:

> From the very beginning, Catholic authorities have insisted upon Catholic schools for Catholic children on all levels. This has been the universal attitude of the Catholic church and, as we have seen, Catholics of Upper Canada felt no differently on this point than Catholics anywhere else.[98]

It can be concluded, therefore, that the Catholic hierarchy in Canada supported this theme as fervently as their neighbours to the south.

The permeation principle of Catholic education was another important theme in the Catholic theory of schooling. This principle was regarded as a necessity if Catholic schools were to function effectively. The concurrence of the French Canadian Catholic

hierarchy with the papal position on this theme was documented by Kistler:

> To the French Canadian, religion and education are completely one; it would be impossible to separate them. Education which is not inspired by and filled with religion is not education at all. The Roman Catholic holds that true religion does not exist outside the Catholic Church; therefore, education, to be truly sound, must, of necessity, be Roman Catholic education.[99]

This acceptance of Vatican directives on permeation was also true of Ontario. The authors of the sketch of Catholic education in Ontario, referred to earlier, discussed the necessity of a Catholic atmosphere as follows:

> It is, therefore, the primary function of the Church and of Catholic education to ensure the child's salvation in the light of these truths. The obvious educational implication is that the entire work of the school must be conducive to this end or, in other words, that the teaching of all subjects related to human life and conduct must be permeated with the Catholic religious point of view.[100]

The permeation concept was, therefore, as central to Canadian Catholic schooling as it was to Catholic schooling in the United States. In fact, it could be described as one of the universal tenets of Catholic educational doctrine.

Like their American counterparts, Canadian Catholic educational authors of this period assumed that Catholic teachers would act responsibly and carry out their duties effectively. Moreover, since religious personnel were in the majority in the schools, it was anticipated that they would have the necessary expertise, would be aware of their duties and responsibilities and would serve as examples for lay teachers.

From the materials examined, it is apparent that the Canadian Catholic hierarchy was more concerned with the issues related to establishment and maintenance of Catholic schools than with the role of teachers. However, since the ultramontane Canadian Catholic hierarchy endorsed papal directives on the other themes, it can be concluded that they were influenced by the Vatican regarding teacher preparation, responsibilities and characteristics. In fact, in his petition to have separate normal school classes for nuns, Leduc contended that:

> . . . these devoted women who have in view only God, the good of the children and the rewards of Heaven . . . [were] governed by Rules and Constitutions approved by the Church. They cannot on any account exempt themselves from these Constitutions.[101]

It follows, therefore, that religious congregations devoted to teaching would adhere to the dictates of the Vatican in all matters related to their vocation.

The final theme discussed in this study -- the relationship between intellectual and moral/religious education -- was often discussed by Catholic educational leaders. Leduc emphasized the necessity of blending religious and intellectual learning:

> Godless education will eventually bring man back to the savage state, or to say the least, to that pagan and dissolute civilization, which sullied the earth before the coming of the Messiah . . . We, Catholics, disavow and reject, with all our might, schools in which the teaching is purely natural.[102]

The Bishops of the First Plenary Council endorsed Leo XIII's demand that the school should provide pupils with intellectual as well as moral training in keeping with their religious beliefs.[103] Daly suggested that, since religion was so very important to Catholics,

intellectual and moral/religious education could not be separated:

> In education one cannot separate the utilitarian side -- the fitting of the child for the struggle of life, -- from its main purpose, -- the development of moral character. The moral aspect alone gives to human life its true character, its real value.[104]

French Canadian Catholic educational leaders also insisted that a welding of intellectual pursuits and moral/religious instruction should take place in Catholic schools. This is evident in Kistler's summary:

> The basic principle of French Canadian educational philosophy is that education is a function of the family, which has, in turn, the right to delegate this authority to any agency or organization desired. Since religion is the guardian of men's souls, the family has chosen the Church to be its partner in the instruction of its children. The aim of education is not simply to fill one's mind with a wide assortment of facts but to give a philosophy of life and to develop moral character and love of country. Education should supply one's individual needs and help one to fill usefully his place in the universal scheme of things.[105]

The views expressed by Daly and Kistler concerning the relationship that should exist between intellectual and moral/religious education were echoed by L.A. Hochstein in her master's thesis on Catholic education in Alberta written in 1954:

> A Catholic philosophy of education is built upon and flows from a Catholic philosophy of life. Not that Catholic teachers find the aims and objectives of secular education unacceptable because they are vicious or wrong in themselves but because they ignore or neglect some fundamental aspect of man's nature and final end.[106]

In other words, Catholic children should attend Catholic schools because these schools catered to their moral development and provided the religious education they needed as part of their preparation for "everlasting life" in addition to providing the same basic

intellectual programme as the secular schools. Statements by Canadian and American Catholic educational authors concerning the six themes discussed in this chapter invariably replicated papal directives. The ultramontane Canadian and American religious and lay educators endorsed the papal directives concerning the divine mission of the church to educate, the rights, responsibilities and duties of parents regarding the education of their offspring, the permeation principle of Catholic schooling, Catholic schools for all Catholic children and the necessity of combining moral/religious and intellectual education. Despite the fact that little was written about the responsibilities and characteristics of teachers, it can be concluded that the Catholic hierarchy in these two countries were also in agreement with the Vatican on this theme.

Conclusion

The Catholic theory of schooling has been described as a set of directive doctrines that originated in papal encyclicals that involved certain recurring themes. The major themes identified were defined by the popes and endorsed by the ultramontane American and Canadian religious and lay educational writers. The papal sources, American publications and Canadian materials reviewed all agreed on the basic requirements of Catholic schooling. It can be concluded, therefore, that the popes provided the directives concerning who had the mission to educate, whose responsibility it was to ensure that children were properly educated, the type of school environment that was suitable for Catholic children and the

relationship that should exist between intellectual and moral/ religious education. These directives were endorsed by the American and Canadian Catholic religious and lay educational authorities and were continually called upon to support their demands for Catholic schooling for all Catholic children.

The fact that Catholic schools survived, in the period under study, as private enterprises in America and as public or private institutions in Canada despite secular opposition to them is ample proof of the dedication of the Catholic educational hierarchy to Catholic schooling. As noted earlier, because the Catholic church is an organization with a leader whose authority is acknowledged by national church hierarchies throughout the world, it is relatively easy for a theory, developed by the Vatican over time, to be widely diffused. Moreover, endorsement of the views of a leader is more easily achieved when that leader is regarded as the ultimate authority. Further, directives are accepted unquestioningly when they serve as reinforcement of the position of a minority. Since this was the situation in English-speaking Canada and the United States, papal directives on schooling were readily endorsed and used by the local hierarchy to support their demands. It can be concluded, therefore, that papal directives concerning the Catholic theory of schooling were carefully studied by the American and Canadian Catholic hierarchy and subsequently utilized to support their demands for Catholic schools for all Catholic children. The six themes of the Catholic theory of schooling, enunciated by the popes and endorsed by the North American hierarchy, provided the

foundations for the Catholic theory of schooling in the North-West Territories (1875-1905) and in Alberta (1905-1960).

Footnotes

[1]K. Westhues, "The Adaptation of the Roman Catholic Church in Canadian Society," Religion in Canadian Society (Crysdale and Wheatcroft eds.) Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1976. p. 291.

[2]Ibid., p. 297.

[3]M. Wade, The French Canadians 1760-1967 Volume I. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd. (Revised Edition) 1975. p. 6.

[4]J.M.S. Careless, Canada: A Story of Challenge (Revised Edition) Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1970. p. 64.

[5]Ibid., p. 65.

[6]Pius IX, Quum Non Sine, July 14, 1864, Papal Teachings: Education, Selected and arranged by the Benedictine Monks of Solesmes, Boston: St. Paul Press, 1960. p. 52.

[7]Pius IX, Allocution to the German Literary Society, January 12, 1873. Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 58.

[8]Leo XIII, Officio Sanctissimo, December 22, 1887, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 105. According to Leo XIII: "God has committed to the Church the office of teaching religion, which all men need to reach eternal salvation. No other society has received this mandate and no other society can appropriate it." Ibid.

[9]Ibid., p. 106.

[10]Leo XIII, Libertas, June 20, 1888; Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 112.

[11]Benedict XV, Commisso Divinitis, September 8, 1916, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 163.

[12]Pius XI, Caritatem Decet, March 4, 1929, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 194.

[13]Pius XI, Ci Si E Domandato, May 30, 1929, Papal Teachings, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

[14]Pius XI, Divini Ilius Magistri, December 31, 1929, Papal Teachings, op. cit. p. 201. This encyclical is the most

quoted of all the papal documents discussed. Pius XI is regarded as the defender of Catholic educational rights because of this document. However close examination of the writings of Leo XIII will reveal that he had said most of the things that Pius XI was given credit for.

[15]Ibid., p. 203.

[16]Ibid., p. 204.

[17]Leo XIII, Nobillisima Gallorum Gens, February 8, 1884, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 95.

[18]Leo XIII, Sapientae Christianae, January 10, 1890, Papal Teachings, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

[19]Leo XIII, Affari Vos, December 8, 1897, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 138. Leo XIII directed this encyclical to the Bishops of Canada after the Laurier-Greenway compromise in Manitoba. While he recognized that the Catholics in Manitoba had lost many of their privileges, he urged them to accept the compromise while continuing to seek further privileges through negotiations rather than confrontation.

[20]Pius XI, Allocution to the Students of the Mondragone College, May 14, 1929, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 196.

[21]Pius IX, Instructions to the Bishops of the United States, November 24, 1875, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 68.

[22]Leo XIII, Militantis Ecclesiae, August 1, 1897, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 132.

[23]Benedict XV, Communes Litteras, April 10, 1919, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 167.

[24]Pius XI, Divini Ilius Magistri, December 31, 1929, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 238. According to Pius XI, Catholic schooling for Catholic children was a necessity. Therefore, in situations where these schools were not state-supported Catholics should ensure that they continue to operate by supporting and defending them whenever necessary.

[25]Pius XII, Le Sujet Qu'ont Choisi, July 27, 1946, Papal Teachings, op. cit., pp. 350-351.

[26]Pius XII, Pour Commemorer, August 24, 1955, Papal Teachings, op. cit. p. 499.

[27]Leo XIII, Militantis Ecclesiae, op. cit. p. 133.

[28]Pius XI, Divini Ilius Magistri, op. cit. p. 237.

[29]Pius XII, Allocution to the College of St. Joseph, May 6, 1951, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 396.

[30]Leo XIII, Officio Sanctissimo, op. cit. p. 108.

[31]Leo XIII, Affari Vos, op. cit. p. 140.

[32]Benedict XV, Libenter Quidem, Papal Teachings, op. cit. p. 170.

[33]Pius XI, Quandoquidem Probe, April 25, 1922, Papal Teachings, op. cit. p. 176.

[34]Pius XI, Divini Ilius Magistri, op. cit. p. 240.

[35]Pius XII, Allocutions to the Italian Association of Catholic School teachers, September 2, 1948, the Italian Catholic Union of secondary teachers, September 4, 1949 and the Italian Catholic Elementary School Teachers' Association, November 4, 1955, Papal Teachings, op. cit. pp. 362-363, 376, 512-520.

[36]Pius XII, Letter to the Third International Congress of the World Union of Catholic Teachers, August 5, 1957, Papal Teachings, op. cit. pp. 554-555.

[37]Pius XII, Allocution to the Italian Association of Catholic Teachers, op. cit. pp. 362-363.

[38]Pius XII, Allocution for the second centenary of the Beatification of St. Joseph Calasanctius, November 22, 1948, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 368.

[39]Pius XII, Allocution to the Italian Catholic Union of Secondary Teachers, op. cit. p. 381.

[40]Pius XII, Allocution to the Italian Catholic Elementary School Teachers' Association, op. cit. p. 514.

[41]Pius XII, Allocution to the Primary School Supervisors of Spain, July 3, 1956, Papal Teachings, op. cit. p. 532.

[42]Pius XI, Con Vivo Compiacimento, April 22, 1922, Papal Teachings, op. cit., p. 173. According to Pius XI, the church had to maintain its authority in the scientific field. In addition, the church had never attempted to hinder the development of arts and sciences but rather it favoured and promoted that development.

[43]Pius XI, Quando Quidem Probe, op. cit. p. 176.

[44]Pius XI, Divini Ilius Magistri, op. cit. p. 243.

[45]Pius XII, Allocution for the second Centenary of the Beautification of St. Joseph Calasanctius, op. cit. pp. 370-371.

[46]Pius XII, Allocution to the College of St. Joseph, op. cit. p. 395.

[47]Pius XII, Letter to the Third International Congress of the World Union of Catholic Teachers, op. cit. pp. 555-556.

[48]E.B. Jordan, "Catholic Education: Its Philosophy and Background," Essays on Catholic Education in the United States, (R.J. De Ferrari, ed.), New York: Catholic University of America, 1942. p. 20.

[49]W.J. McGucken, The Catholic Way in Education, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934. p. 81.

[50]New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. II (edited by the Staff of the Catholic University of America) New York: McGraw Hill, 1967. p. 41.

[51]Ibid., p. 42.

[52]R.J. Bishop, "Book Reviews," The Modern Schoolman, Vol. 20, 1942-43. pp. 51-52.

[53]F. DeHovre and E.B. Jordan, Philosophy and Education, New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930. p. xxix.

[54]F. DeHovre and E.B. Jordan, Catholicism in Education, New York: Benziger Brothers, 1934. p. 118.

[55]J.A. Burns, The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States, New York: Arno Press Inc. (reprint edition) 1969. p. 22.

[56]J.D. Redden and F.A. Ryan, A Catholic Philosophy of Education, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1942. p. 105.

[57]N.G. McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1959. pp. 70-71.

[58]Ibid., p. 178.

[59]P.H. Hallett, What is a Catholic? New York: Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1961. p. 181. Hallett suggested that, since the school had to equip the child for the divine society of heaven as well as for human society, the school comes within the purview of the Church which has the divine right to educate.

[60]N.G. McCluskey, Catholic Education in America: A Documentary History, New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964. p. 175. Canon 1113 reads as follows: "Parents are bound by a most serious obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral, as well as for the physical and civil, education of their children, and also to provide for their temporal welfare." Canon 1372 stressed the need for religious and moral training in education and added that not only parents, but also all who take the place of parents, have the obligation to provide children with a Christian education. Ibid.

[61]Ibid., pp. 79-80.

[62]Burns, op. cit., pp. 225-226. Cardinal Manning had maintained that: "By the law of nature, fathers and mothers have by right the guardianship of their own children. Parents have the right to control the education of their children." Ibid.

[63]Redden and Ryan, op. cit. p. 108.

[64]McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, op. cit. p. 88.

[65]Hallett, op. cit., p. 56. In a United States Supreme Court decision, handed down in Oregon on June 22, 1925, the primary right of parents to decide how a child should be educated was upheld. The judge concluded: "The fundamental theory of liberty, upon which all governments in this Union repose, excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not a mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional duties." Ibid.

[66]McCluskey, Catholic Education in America, op. cit. p. 94.

[67]V.P. Lannie, "Church and School Triumphant: The Sources of American Catholic Historiography," History of Education Quarterly, Vol. 16, #2, 1976. pp. 133-134.

[68]McCluskey, Catholic Education in America, op. cit. pp. 1 and 25.

[69]Ibid., pp. 92-93.

[70]Redden and Ryan, op. cit., pp. 206-207. According to Redden and Ryan, every Catholic child should have access to Catholic schooling simply because Catholic religious education is indispensable for every Catholic child. A public school education with an after-school religious class was an inadequate substitute for a Catholic school that was permeated by a religious atmosphere.

[71]G.N. Shuster, Catholic Education in a Changing World, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Ltd., 1967. p. 35.

[72]J.O. Murray, A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States, quoted in Lannie, op. cit. p. 136.

[73]McGucken, op. cit. p. 68.

[74]Redden and Ryan, op. cit. pp. 192 and 198.

[75]W. Bless, "The Role of the School in the Religious Formation of Youth," Catholic Education: A Book of Readings (W.B. Kolesnik and E.J. Power, eds.) New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1965.

[76]McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, op. cit. p. 95.

[77]R.G. Bandas, Religion Teaching and Practice, New York: J.F. Wagner Inc., 1939. p. 14.

[78]Redden and Ryan, op. cit. pp. 339-340.

[79]McGucken, op. cit. p. 14.

[80]J. McGlade, Progressive Educators and the Catholic Church, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1953. p. 42 and McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, op. cit. pp. 70-71. McGlade summarized Catholicism by reiterating that Catholics believe that God exists, that He created man of body and soul and that man has freewill and is responsible for his actions. Because of that belief system, children should be educated in an environment where that belief system was reinforced. For McGlade, progressive education was secular, godless and unsuited to the needs of Catholic children. According to McCluskey, a Catholic begins with the assumption that religion is central to human existence. A Catholic believes that he has to live in such a way as to prepare himself for his supernatural destiny. Further, God has given him the church to assist him in his pursuit of the eternal objective. Because of this belief system, Catholics felt that secular schools would be spiritually harmful to their children. Ibid.

[81]McGucken, op. cit. p. 38.

[82]Ibid., p. 46.

[83]J. Maritain, Education at the Crossroads, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

[84]A. Virginia. "The cruel choice facing Catholic Education," Kolesnik and Power, op. cit. p. 136.

[85]Redden and Ryan, op. cit. pp. 191-291. Redden and Ryan stated that, since the goal of Christian education was the formation of the true Christian, instruction and training in religion were necessary elements of Christian schooling. Intellectual education implied enlightenment and training of the faculty of thought while moral education necessitated training in principles in conformity with the law and character education. Since religious, moral and intellectual education all involved training and strengthening of the will the three could not be taught separately but should all be part of the educational process.

[86]E.E.Y. Hales, The Catholic Church in the Modern World, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1958. p. 171.

[87]G.B. Phelan, "The Problems of Communication between Catholic and non-Catholic educators and philosophers," Kolesnik and Power, op. cit. p. 158.

[88]McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, op. cit. p. 167.

[89]E.F. Henderson et al., Historical Sketch of the Separate School System of Ontario and the Catholic Separate School Minority Report, Toronto: The English Catholic Education Association of Ontario, 1950. p. 82.

[90]H. Leduc, Hostility Unmasked: School Ordinance of 1892 of the North-West Territories and Its Disastrous Results, Montreal: C.O. Beauchemin and Son, 1896, p. 7.

[91]R.B. Kistler, "Religion, Education and Language as Factors in French Canadian Cultural Survival," Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, New York University, 1947, p. 92.

[92]Henderson et al., Historical Sketch, op. cit., pp. 38 and 83.

[93]Pastoral Letter of the Fathers of the First Plenary Council of Quebec, September 19 to Nov. 1, 1909, p. 19.

[94]G.T. Daly, Catholic Problems in Western Canada, Toronto: McMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1921, p. 158.

[95]Ibid., p. 163.

[96]Kistler, op. cit. p. 120.

[97]Pastoral Letter, op. cit. pp. 23-24. The bishops used the following statement, from Leo XIII's Affari Vos, to support their position on Catholic schooling: "Our children cannot go for instruction to schools which either ignore or of set purpose combat the Catholic religion, or in which its teachings are despised and its fundamental principles repudiated." Ibid.

[98]Henderson et al., Historical Sketch, op. cit., p. 79.

[99]Kistler, op. cit. p. 92.

[100]Henderson et al., op. cit. p. 103.

[101]Leduc, op. cit. p. 32.

[102]Ibid., p. 56.

[103]Pastoral Letter, op. cit. p. 24. The bishops noted that Leo XIII had given the following description of the type of school Catholics should demand for their children: "Justice and reason demand that the school provide for its pupils not only an intellectual training but also that system of moral teaching in harmony with the principles of our religion, without which, far from being of use, education can be nothing but harmful." Ibid. They were fully supportive of his position.

[104]Daly, op. cit. p. 176.

[105]Kistler, op. cit. pp. 203-204.

[106]L.A. Hochstein, "Roman Catholic Separate and Public Schools in Alberta," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1954, p. 1.

Chapter III

The Oblates as Schoolmen, 1875-1920

Introduction

Roman Catholic missionary activities in Alberta began with the arrival of J.B. Thibault, a secular priest, in Edmonton in 1842.[1] The following year, he established a mission at Lac Ste Anne, about fifty miles North-West of Edmonton.[2] With the arrival of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in the 1850's Roman Catholic missionary activity in Alberta expanded. The Oblate congregation had its origins in France:

> The Oblates of Mary Immaculate, at first a body of priests known as the missionaries of Provence, were brought into being by a zealous young priest named Charles Joseph Eugene de Mazenod in 1816. They received their present name, and canonical approbation from Pope Leo XII in 1826.[3]

Six members of the congregation arrived in Montreal on December 2, 1841 to pursue missionary activities in Canada.[4] The Oblates were ultramontanist. They believed in papal supremacy in matters of faith and doctrine, therefore, they advocated absolute obedience to all papal directives. Since they were primarily missionaries who were not known, as the Jesuits were, for educational activities, they relied on papal directives for instructions regarding schooling. Their initial goal was to establish missions throughout the North West Territories.

Ultramontanism re-surfaced in France in the nineteenth century. This was a period of religious revival in the Catholic church that led to the establishment of new religious orders which accepted the 1870 Vatican Council notion of papal infallibility and wanted to restore the church to its twelfth century eminence.[5] The Oblates were one

of these new orders that came out of revolutionary France suspicious of the state. They arrived in Canada at a time when the local Catholic church was becoming aggressive and assertive.[6] In Quebec Bishops I. Bourget and J. Lafleche rejected gallicanism and welcomed ultramontanism which upheld the principle of obedience to religious authority. J. Monet described the ultramontanes as Catholics who were rigid in their adherence to unchanging principles:

> The ultramontanes . . . were rigid Catholics used to "refuting the errors of our time" with a doctrine which they proudly wanted as "toujours une, toujours sublime, toujours la même." They were accustomed to think in an atmosphere rarified by unchanging principles.[7]

Some of the basic principles of ultramontanism were that state education and materialism were modern errors, there should be uncritical obedience to the church, temporal power must bow to the spiritual and it was pointless to innovate since official church doctrine provided all the answers.[8] Ultramontanist pronouncements were based on absolute declarations and there was no room for doubt or questioning. In addition, the need for religious education was one of the overruling concerns of the ultramontanists.

As will be seen in this chapter, the Oblate bishops in the Diocese of St. Albert and the Archdiocese of Edmonton pursued a course of action that was in keeping with the principles of ultramontanism throughout their episcopates. This policy was particularly evident in their unquestioning acceptance of papal directives on schooling. In subsequent chapters it will be seen that the secular bishops who headed the Archdiocese from 1920-1964 also accepted the papal position on schooling uncritically. Therefore, it appears to be evident that ultramontanism in the Edmonton Archdiocese was not confined to the

Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

In 1852, A. Lacombe, an Oblate, joined Thibault at the Lac St. Anne mission. By 1861, he had established the St. Albert mission which later became the seat of the Diocese of St. Albert.[9] The Oblate congregation in Alberta was further strengthened by the arrival of H. Leduc (1867) and Bishop V. Grandin (1868). Thus, by 1870, when Manitoba attained provincial status and the North West Territories came under the control of the lieutenant-governor of Manitoba, Roman Catholic missions were firmly established in what was to become central Alberta.

By 1875, when the North West Territories Act was passed, the Vatican had developed a perspective or theory of Catholic schooling. This theory was based on a set of directives concerning the tenets of Catholic education. Five themes of this perspective or theory had been enunciated. These were the divine mission of the church to educate; the educational responsibilities of parents; Catholic schooling for Catholic children; the permeation theory of Catholic education; and the relationship between intellectual and religious education. As discussed in the previous chapter, Pius IX had upheld the church's mission to educate and the necessity for Catholic children to attend Catholic schools in Quum Non Sine (1864) as well as his Allocution to the German Literary Society (1873). Further, in 1875 he had instructed Catholic leaders in the United States to set up more Catholic schools. The papal directives regarding the role of the church in education, the need for Catholic schooling and the importance of religious education were, therefore, already in place by 1875.

In this chapter Oblate involvement in Roman Catholic schooling in the North West Territories from 1875 to 1905, and in Alberta from

1905 to 1920 will be examined to determine whether they had developed an indigenous theory of schooling or if they were merely following papal perspectives. Section one will describe the development of Catholic schooling in the Territorial period and the role of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in that development. In the second section, the period 1905-1920 will be examined from the perspective of the educational role played by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in negotiations with the Alberta Liberal government. It should be noted that throughout the period 1875-1920 the bishops of Edmonton were members of the Oblate order. Therefore, whenever possible, their comments or reaction to educational legislation will be analysed to determine if they had an indigenous theoretical perspective on schooling or if they were merely attempting to implement the themes enunciated by the popes.

It is suggested that, because the Oblates were missionaries rather than educators, they relied on papal directives for guidance, hence they did not develop a unique theory of schooling. In fact, they accepted papal pronouncements on schooling unquestioningly and worked towards the development and maintenance of Catholic schooling in keeping with Vatican perspectives. Because of their ultramontane belief system, local Oblates readily defended the Catholic educational ideals of the Vatican and engaged in confrontation, compromise and negotiations with territorial and provincial leaders when these ideals were threatened. The work done by the Oblates during the years 1875-1920 lay the foundations for the Catholic perspective on schooling after 1920 when the leadership of the local

Catholic church was no longer in Oblate hands. This chapter will, therefore, provide the historical background to Catholic schooling in Alberta, summarize the Oblate response to territorial and provincial school legislation, and determine their theoretical perspective on schooling.

Territorial School Law and the Oblates, 1875-1905

In April, 1875, the North-West Territories Act was passed. This Act provided for a lieutenant-governor and council for the Territories and ended the primitive system that had existed from 1870 when the Territories had been placed under the administration of the lieutenant-governor of Manitoba.[10] Section eleven of the 1875 Act empowered the lieutenant-governor and council of the Territories to pass necessary ordinances with respect to education as soon as a system of taxation had been devised:

> A majority of the rate-payers of any district or portion of the North-West Territories or any lesser portion or sub-division thereof, by whatever name the same may be known may establish such schools therein, as they may think fit and make the necessary assessment and collection of taxes therefor, and further that the minority of the rate-payers, therein, whether Protestant or Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such latter case the rate-payers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.[11]

This statute guaranteed the continuance of separate schools, being either Catholic or Protestant, that had existed in the Territories since the missionaries had first established schools.

In 1884, the first North-West School Ordinance, a key piece of legislation that laid the basis for future educational development in the Territories, was passed. Lupul found that the first eight sections of that Ordinance were practically a carbon copy of the Manitoba School Act of 1871.[12] For the Catholic hierarchy, the significant features of that first school Ordinance were as follows:

> A twelve man Board of Education to be appointed by the lieutenant-governor-in-council was divided into Protestant and Catholic sections, each controlling its own schools, licensing its teachers, selecting its books and apparatus (books having reference to religion and morals for the Catholic section being "subject to the approval of the competent religious authority") and appointing its school inspectors.[13]

In short, this School Ordinance transplanted the dual systems of schooling of Quebec to the North-West Territories in 1884 as it had been transplanted to Manitoba in 1871. Several minor and a few major amendments were made between 1884 and 1892 that gradually changed the dual system to a unitary system with separate school guarantees.

The dual system of schooling that was in place in 1884 gave the Catholic hierarchy complete control of their section of the board. They were empowered to make decisions concerning such major issues as religious and moral training, text books, school apparatus and teacher licensing requirements. As far as the Catholic hierarchy in the North-West Territories was concerned, the dual system was fair and just. If the Catholic perspective on schooling, as enunciated by Pius IX, was to be effectively implemented Catholics had to be free to operate their publicly funded schools without state interference. In this way, the divine mission of the church to

teach would be fulfilled through clerical domination of the schools. Since the clientele of the schools were Catholic and the teachers were mainly religious personnel, the entire school day would be permeated by a Christian atmosphere. Further, Catholic schools would cater to the intellectual as well as the religious needs of their pupils. Thus, the control accorded the hierarchy by the dual system created the conditions for implementation of the Catholic perspective on schooling in the Catholic schools of the North-West Territories.

The dual system of schooling in the North-West was shortlived. Between 1885 and 1892 a series of ordinances was passed that gradually changed schooling in the Territories from a dual to a unitary system. It should be noted that by 1885 Roman Catholics were in the minority in the Territories. Hence, they could no longer justify their demand for a dual system on the grounds of population. They saw themselves as a minority whose rights were being infringed by the majority.

The first piece of legislation that altered the 1884 position of the Catholics regarding schooling was the 1885 School Ordinance which reduced the membership of the Board of Education from twelve to five[14] and started a gradual trend towards a single Board of Education for all schools. Another important change was made in the Ordinance of 1886 which "limited the establishment of a separate school district to the area of a public school district previously enacted by the majority of rate-payers."[15] In other words, a separate school district could not be formed unless a public school district already existed in that area. A further lessening of

Catholic autonomy occurred in 1887:

> The School Ordinance of 1887 fixed membership of the Board of Education at two years and representation on the Board changed from two Protestants and two Roman Catholics to five Protestants and three Roman Catholics.[16]

This change reflected population figures in the North-West Territories. Catholics were in the minority, therefore, they could no longer have equal representation with Protestants on the Board of Education.

During the legislative session of 1891-92 amendments were implemented that further reduced Catholic control over schooling. In that session, a bill was tabled in the territorial legislature by F. Mowat designed to abolish the dual system of schools.[17] However, the Premier of the Territories, F.W.G. Haultain, suggested that Mowat's bill be held over for the next session since time was limited. Mowat agreed and withdrew the bill. In a surprise move the following day Haultain introduced a bill to amend the School Ordinance which he described as largely based on Mowat's bill and which was necessary for the business of the schools to proceed smoothly.[18] The main changes implemented by that bill, passed during the 1891-92 session of the legislature were: the Board of Education would only hold office during the pleasure of the lieutenant-governor-in-council; members of the Board would meet in Regina at the request of the appointing authority; school inspectors would be appointed by the lieutenant-governor-in-council; a uniform set of text books would be introduced for student teachers; and the lieutenant-governor would appoint a general board of examiners to

certify teachers.[19] Haultain's amendment to the School Ordinance paved the way for the December 1892 Ordinance that completed the transformation of the school system from a dual to a unitary model.

The School Ordinance of December, 1892 was the last major piece of legislation leading to a unitary system with the minority having the right to establish separate schools in existing public school districts. The main features of the 1892 School Ordinance were that a Council of Public Instruction would assume all the powers of the Board of Education, secondary education would be non-sectarian, inspectors were relieved of the responsibility of examining and certifying teachers and English was to be the language of instruction.[20]

The 1891-92 Ordinance weakened the position of the Catholic sectarian schools. The 1892 Ordinance further reduced Catholic control over their schools. By 1893, the Catholic hierarchy in Alberta were fully aware of their reduced control over the Catholic schools of the North-West. Leduc, accompanied by Abbé Caron and A.E. Forget, the two Catholic representatives on the Council of Public Instruction, went to Regina to discuss Catholic grievances with Premier Haultain and D. Goggin, Superintendent of Education for the Territories. Leduc later described the interview as fruitless. He was convinced that the Council intended "to carry out the programme of the Freemasons: godless schools, banishment of all Catholic religious education and warfare against all convents and teaching orders without regard to congregation."[21] Leduc returned to St. Albert determined to lead the minority's campaign to have the 1892

School Ordinance disallowed by the Federal government.

Leduc's campaign against the 1892 legislation, his efforts to obtain certification for sisters and lay Catholic teachers and his attempts to get special text books for Catholic schools are all well documented in his work Hostility Unmasked. In this treatise Leduc discussed the 1892 Ordinance and described the ways in which it violated the rights of Roman Catholics in the North-West. As far as he was concerned, the 1892 Ordinance was intended to deprive Catholics of their rights. He suggested that the Catholics in the Territories were aware of the situation and were ready to resist the school system that was being imposed upon them with all their might.[22]

Leduc contended that separate schools did not really exist after 1892 but were only such in name. Prior to 1892, Catholics possessed the right to control and direct their own schools, to pass regulations for management and discipline, and to choose textbooks and appoint inspectors.[23] Further, there had been Protestant and Catholic sections of the Board of Education. However, after 1892 that Board was changed to a Council of Public Instruction which provided for two Catholic members in an advisory capacity rather than in a decision-making position. Leduc saw the School Ordinance of 1892 as:

> the inspiration of a secret society the spirit of which oozes out of its every pore [and] the Council of Public Instruction has appealed to the pedagogical intelligence of a devoted brother who is a high dignitary of the section[24]

In other words, he saw the Ordinance of 1892 as tainted by Freemasonry and regarded Superintendent Goggin as the villain of the piece.

Leduc accused the Territorial Government of anti-Catholic sentiments and of introducing "secular, compulsory, godless, materialistic or at most Protestant education."[25] He also outlined the ways in which he felt Catholics were being discriminated against. Two of these were obligatory normal school training for nuns and discrimination in the granting of professional certificates to nuns as well as lay Catholics.[26] He listed names and described in detail instances of this that had been brought to his attention. Another area of dissatisfaction was the awarding of provisional certificates. He accused the Superintendent and the Council of Public Instruction of "excessive severity and stiffness" in their dealings with Catholic applicants for provisional certificates.[27]

Another area of concern was the appointment of school inspectors. Leduc stated that, before 1892, each section of the Board of Education appointed its own inspectors. However, after 1892, of the four inspectors appointed, only one was a Catholic, a priest who resigned because "obligations incompatible with his vocation were imposed upon him."[28] A further subject of contention was the inspection of a school in St. Albert in 1894:

> We characterize this inspection as being hostile and malignant! hostile because Messrs. Goggin and Calder are known to hold most extreme views against the principles that we hold most dear, viz: the principle of separate schools; and malignant because the inspection was held in secret.[29]

As Leduc saw it, the purpose of the inspection was to discredit the school and the work of the sisters. Another area of discontent as far as the Catholic hierarchy was concerned was the readers and history text books prescribed for use in the schools. Leduc argued

that Catholic pupils should have Catholic readers and history texts written by Catholics. It should be noted that Leduc's campaign against the 1892 School Ordinance was endorsed by A. Langevin, Archbishop of St Boniface and V. Grandin, Bishop of St Albert.[30] The Catholic leaders were, therefore, united in their opposition to that Ordinance.

It is apparent that the Catholic leaders were dissatisfied with the school system of 1892 and would have welcomed a reversal to the position they had enjoyed in 1884. However, they realized that they would be asking too much if they made such a demand. What, then, were they seeking? The requests made to the Standing Committee on Education by the Catholic representatives in 1894 were: that the 1892 Ordinance be amended; that there should be special normal school sessions for nuns and lay females only; that there should be text book changes for Catholic schools and that bilingualism should be permitted.[31] Father Leduc's Hostility Unmasked is the most comprehensive document outlining the Catholic position regarding the school system and the concessions Catholics were seeking in 1894. Although the Ordinance was not disallowed and the changes that the Catholics requested were not instituted the Catholic hierarchy did not give up. Negotiations and requests continued to be made after 1894 but to no avail.

The demands of the Catholic hierarchy, as expressed by Leduc, were in keeping with the Catholic theory of schooling. Both Pius IX and Leo XIII insisted that the church had the divine mission to educate, parents had the primary right in education, Catholic children

should be educated in Catholic schools, a religious atmosphere should permeate the entire school day, and religious education should be an integral part of the curriculum. Although Leduc and the other Catholic spokesmen did not specifically discuss theory, their demands reflected adherence to the papal directives on schooling. For example, requests for Catholic text books in Catholic schools, special concessions regarding normal school training for religious personnel, retention of the Catholic separate school system with religious education included in the curriculum and appointment of a Catholic school inspector for Catholic schools were all in keeping with the Catholic perspective on schooling. If the Catholic hierarchy retained control over Catholic schools they would be in a position to implement the basic principles of Catholic educational theory in those schools.

The 1890's was a period of turmoil over school matters for the Catholics of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. As previously stated, on December 8, 1897 Leo XIII had directed the encyclical Affari Vos to the Bishops of Canada. In outlining some of the requirements of Catholic education, the pontiff condemned non-religious schools and contended that without religion there could be no moral education. He further stated that Catholics should be free to organize schools in which teaching was in accordance with the Catholic faith. Catholic teachers should be employed in those schools and the readers and textbooks should be subject to the approval of the bishops. Finally, Leo XIII urged the Catholics of Manitoba to accept the concessions which they had been granted while continuing to negotiate for better conditions. This encyclical was

as relevant to the North-West Territories as it was to Manitoba. The requirements of Catholic education that were outlined were in accordance with the requests that had been made by Leduc, Grandin and other members of the Catholic hierarchy. Moreover, the idea of continuing to work to gain further concessions was also relevant because it influenced the line of action taken by Catholic leaders in the North-West Territories after 1897.

Impressed by Leo XIII's encyclical, Grandin read it from the pulpit at St Albert on January 21, 1898.[32] Two weeks later, he issued a pastoral letter related to the same issue. In that pastoral letter, dated February 7, 1898, Grandin endorsed the church's divine mission to educate:

> God, through the Pope, bishops, priests and intrepid Christians, defends the indefeasible rights of conscience and the human soul; He claims without compromise or weakness the right of Christian education.[33]

Bishop Grandin also called for Catholic schools for all Catholic children and a proper balance between religious and temporal preparation in these schools. Further, he exhorted all Catholics in his diocese to unite in their efforts to keep their religion intact and use all means at their disposal to pass it on to their children:

> To attain this we must first endeavour to establish Catholic schools everywhere we can -- schools wherein our children, while acquiring material knowledge to fit them for this temporal life, may at the same time learn their obligations to God and themselves, to their parents and neighbours.[34]

From the above, it can be concluded that Grandin fully endorsed the Catholic perspective on schooling as enunciated by the Vatican. Moreover, he later instructed E.J. Legal, his coadjutor, to continue

negotiations with the Territorial government for a French Catholic school inspector, a Catholic normal school and Catholic textbooks.[35] These negotiations with the Territorial government continued throughout the period 1898 to 1905. After Alberta became a province Legal ,continued to negotiate with the Liberal government of Alberta in an effort to gain these and other concessions.

In 1901, another School Ordinance was passed in the North-West Territories. In that Ordinance the name of the Department of Public Instruction was changed to the Department of Education and a five-man educational council was to be set up of which two members would be Catholics.[36] From 1901 to 1905 no further changes were made to the existing school laws. In fact, from 1902 Haultain and other members of the Territorial legislature began clamouring for provincial status for the North-West Territories. The school question was, therefore, temporarily overshadowed by the issues surrounding provincial autonomy. However, before provincial autonomy was attained by Alberta and Saskatchewan, there was considerable controversy at the national level and, to a lesser extent, at the territorial level over the school clauses of the Autonomy Bills.

In February, 1905, W. Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, introduced the Autonomy Bills destined to create the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. In his opening speech Laurier said that "the question of the school system which would be introduced -- not introduced because it was introduced long ago -- but should be continued in the Territories"[37] was one of the questions to be considered.

The school clauses of the Autonomy Bills that were presented by Laurier were as follows:

1. the provisions of Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said provinces as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein, were already a province, the expression 'the Union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

2. Subject to the provisions of the said Section 93, and in continuance of the principles here-to-fore sanctioned under the North-West Territories Act, it is enacted that the legislature of the said province shall pass all necessary laws in respect to education; and that it shall therein always be provided

   (a) that a majority of the rate-payers of any district or portion or sub-division thereof, by whatever name it is known may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessments and collections of rates therefore, and (b) that the minority of the rate-payers therein whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools, and make the necessary assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect here to.

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares of proportion.[38]

The school clauses of the bills led to a split in the ranks of the federal Liberal government between February and May, 1905. C. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, resigned over the school clauses and feeling against them was so intense that the Autonomy Bills were not passed until they were amended.

The school clauses of the Autonomy Bills were of major concern to the Catholic hierarchy. Before the bills were introduced, E.J. Legal who had succeeded Grandin as bishop of St Albert in 1900, said in an interview in Montreal:

> If any change is forced upon the Catholics we will fight until we get separate school rights just as the minority in Manitoba will continue to fight to the bitter end.[39]

However, after the bills were tabled he expressed satisfaction with the existing separate school system, stating that, even though it was not the best system, it was one by which Catholics could live peacefully with their Protestant brethren.[40]

As previously stated, the proposed school clauses generated a great deal of controversy. In reference to that controversy A.O. MacRae suggested that:

> the details of this agitation belong rather to the general history of the dominion than to the annals of the Province of Alberta, for strange as it may seem, the clauses concerning education caused but little comment in the two Provinces-to-be, the portion of Canada most directly interested.[41]

Although the reaction in Eastern Canada was stronger, there were a few individuals in Alberta who opposed the school clauses. For example, Reverend D.G. McQueen of Edmonton wrote a letter of thanks to the editor of the Toronto News for his stand concerning the imposition of separate schools and refuted the charge that the West was apathetic. Further, he condemned the school clauses and accused Laurier of "assassinating the principles of Provincial Rights by the advocacy of which he attained power in 1896."[42] Similarly, Dr. McInnis of Edmonton stated in Toronto that the educational clauses

were primarily and radically wrong, that they were designed to satisfy the Oblate Fathers and that if the proposed measures were forced on the West "we will carry the question to the Privy Council in England before we rest."[43] Several other Protestant religious leaders such as A.M. MacDonald, a Baptist pastor in Edmonton,[44] and C. Huestis of the McDougall Methodist Church[45] joined the protest against the school clauses. In an open letter to Prime Minister Laurier, Premier Haultain of the North-West Territories strongly opposed the separate school provisions. He stated that he was opposed to the provisions guaranteeing government aid to separate schools because this was "an infringement of provincial rights."[46]

Because of the reaction to the school clauses among his party members, in the Eastern press and in some parts of Western Canada, Laurier was forced to introduce changes. On March 20, 1905, three amendments to the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bills were presented in the federal parliament. The differences between the proposed amendments and the original school clauses were that the amendments were based on the School Ordinance of 1901 rather than the North-West Territories Act of 1875 and that legislative grants would be paid to schools if they were conducted in accordance with provincial laws, rather than being based upon attendance records. In other words, the new provinces would retain the existing unitary school system with separate school guarantees and would not revert to the dual system of the past. Roman Catholic educators had witnessed the gradual decline of their influence in education between 1884 and 1901. The school clauses of the Autonomy Bills had provided

them with a ray of hope of regaining their lost privileges. That ray of hope died when the school clauses were amended in March, 1905.

When the clauses were amended to avoid a Cabinet split, some members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy felt that they had been betrayed. Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface voiced the feelings of those people in a circular printed in the North-West Review, the official organ of the Catholic church in the West:

> Just as we are committing to the press this circular we learn with unspeakable sorrow that the educational clause destined to be inserted in the Autonomy Bill of the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan will not restore to us the position we held in 1875 . . . [instead] this clause will consecrate the spoilation of our school rights by the ordinances passed up to 1901. . . . Catholics who express their satisfaction at such a state of things betray not only unpardonable ignorance of Catholic educational principles but lack of understanding of the painful position in which we are placed since 1892, ostracized as we truly are, in the Territories.[47]

A rift in the episcopal solidarity of the West was created when Legal declined to append his signature to Langevin's circular.[48] As will be seen later, Legal's approach was in keeping with Leo XIII's advice in Affari Vos -- negotiation rather than confrontation. Thus, on the eve of provincial status, the Oblate leaders were divided over strategy and uncertain of their future role as educators in Alberta. Although the school clauses of the Autonomy Bill retained the existing system, only the future would tell if the new provincial government would be favourably disposed to Catholic separate and public schools. As the first provincial election approached this thought must have been foremost in the minds of the Catholic leaders of Alberta.

Oblate Education in Alberta, 1905-1920

On July 20, 1905, the Autonomy Bills for the creation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan received royal assent.[49] Any further controversy concerning the school question would, therefore, be shifted to the election campaigns for the first provincial governments. In Alberta, A.C. Rutherford, a Liberal, was asked to form a provisional government until the election on November 9, 1905. During the campaign that ensued the Conservatives were seen as the opponents of separate schools whereas the Liberals were united on the school question and were committed to maintaining "the educational status quo."[50] In the election that followed the Liberals won a landslide victory, taking twenty-three of the twenty-five seats.[51] Between 1909 and 1920 there were three provincial elections; the Liberals remained in office until 1921 when they were defeated by the United Farmers of Alberta.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy supported the Liberals in their quest to form the first provincial government of Alberta in 1905. Lupul suggested that the influence of the Catholic church and the school question on the Liberal landslide was not marked, even though R.B. Bennett, the Conservative leader, blamed his defeat on the Catholics.[52] Bishop Legal was pleased with the results of the election. The party which Catholics had supported and which had promised to maintain the educational status quo had attained power. Legal, therefore, saw his future role as a continued struggle for educational concessions. The concessions he sought were similar to those that Father Leduc and other Roman Catholic authorities had

lobbied for earlier. However, the methods he employed were different. Unlike Leduc, he did not attempt to create public agitation; he preferred private consultations and negotiations.

Before describing Legal's line of action in his negotiations with the Liberal government, a summary will be made of the educational rights that Catholics had in 1905. There were two Catholic representatives on the Educational Council; taxes from Catholic rate-payers were used to support Catholic separate schools; Catholic trustees of a separate school district could choose their own teachers provided that the teachers had their diplomas and the last half-hour of the school day could be used for religious instruction. In addition, separate school districts could be formed within the boundaries of existing public school districts and in French-Catholic schools the primary course could be taught in French. That was the Catholic position in 1906 when Legal began negotiations with the Alberta Liberal government for additional concessions. Although some of the themes of the Catholic theory of schooling could be realized through the separate school system, the Catholic hierarchy was not fully satisfied. While the system provided Catholic parents with an alternative by which they could satisfy their right to choose Catholic schooling for their children, it did not allow for implementation of all the papal directives on schooling. For example, because religious education was restricted to the last half-an-hour of the school day, the permeation principle of Catholic schooling could not be realized. In a situation where religious instruction was restricted and regarded as optional, with

parents having the right to withdraw their children from religious classes, it was impossible for the entire school day to be conducted in a religious atmosphere. Similarly, there was no balance between academic and religious training; in fact, academic pursuits were given priority over religious education. Even the theme of Catholic schools for all Catholic children could not be fully realized since a separate school could only be established after a public school had been erected. Further, since the Catholic hierarchy was not in control of text books and equipment used in Catholic schools, it was difficult for the divine educative mission of the church to be fulfilled. Thus, although the Catholic theory of schooling, as enunciated in papal directives, was fully supported by the Oblate hierarchy in Alberta, the school laws and the administrative machinery controlling education did not provide the environment for the practical application of all the themes of the Catholic perspective on schooling.

One of the first issues that Legal discussed with Rutherford, the first Premier and Minister of Education of Alberta, concerned text books. When they met in January, 1907, Legal requested that the Canadian Catholic Readers be permitted for use in Catholic schools and submitted a list of history texts suitable for Catholic students.[53] However, when changes in text books were made later that year none of Legal's submissions were utilized. Another issue raised by Legal in his meeting with Rutherford was the time provided for religious instruction. This was specified in section 137 of the School Act as the last half-hour of the school day. Legal

suggested that the following subsection be added to Section 137:

> That in schools where all the pupils belong to the same denomination, and as long as this condition remains, the half-hour religious instruction may be given at any other time than the last half-hour as the trustees will direct.[54]

Rutherford postponed further discussion of this as he had to leave for Europe.

Legal was more successful on another matter. H.M. Tory, President of the University of Alberta, was of assistance to Bishop Legal in the matter of exchanging diplomas with the University of Alberta. In August, 1908, President Tory had asked Legal to submit his University diploma for exchange. Legal complied and submitted a request for a degree ad eundem gradum from the University of Alberta.[55] He instructed other members of the clergy and the sisters to submit their certificates also. Although the Senate of the University only intended to grant recognition to certificates from English or Canadian Universities, President Tory was able to persuade them to accept those from the University of France as well. Legal was grateful to Tory for his assistance and expressed his appreciation on behalf of the graduates of the University of France residing in Alberta.[56]

Another problem that surfaced during Legal's episcopate was whether Catholic schooling extended to high school education. Legal maintained that Catholics had the right to set up separate high schools and, at a meeting of the Educational Council in November, 1908, the suggestion of N.D. Beck, one of the Catholic representatives on the Council, that the separate school system be extended to the

University, gained the assent of all members.[57] Legal and Beck also tried to get acceptance of Quebec normal school certificates in Alberta. Beck was able to persuade members of the Educational Council to agree to this, while Legal took up the question with Premier Rutherford. However, this issue was unresolved when Rutherford resigned in 1912. Eventually, in 1914, Boyle, the new Minister of Education, made the following decision:

> "Such of the graduates of the Normal Schools under the Catholic Committee of the Council of Public Instruction of the Province of Quebec, holding academic diplomas et qui connaissent assez l'anglais pour pouvoir conduire une école, en se servant de l'anglais, comme medium de l'enseignement," would be eligible to teach in Alberta.[58]

Legal's years of lobbying and negotiating over this issue had finally met with success.

Legal was interested in several other aspects of Catholic education during his episcopate. He supported efforts to establish a Catholic University or College and lobbied for a more equitable distribution of company taxes between public and separate schools. He negotiated for the appointment of a French-Catholic to the inspectorial staff of Alberta and bilingualism in Alberta schools. When he heard of the alleged spreading of agnostic views at the Calgary Normal School by instructors, he was quick to condemn this practice. With regard to the Roman Catholic University this dream was not realized in his lifetime; after his death St. Joseph's College, a Catholic institution affiliated to the University of Alberta, was built. During his lifetime, the Jesuit College at Strathcona was established. The College opened in January, 1914; it

was a bilingual school that enrolled students to grade XII.[59] With regard to the distribution of company taxes, Beck proposed an amendment to the existing legislation to the Educational Council. His suggestion was accepted verbatim, and, as a result, Catholic schools were entitled to a larger share of company taxes. Legal had campaigned for years for the appointment of a French-Catholic inspector. He was able to get a French-Catholic appointed to the Inspectoral staff in 1912. In 1910, he had recommended that J.J. LeBlanc apply for a position as an inspector. LeBlanc was appointed as an inspector in Onoway in 1912; Legal's persistence had been finally rewarded.[60]

Legal's interest in Catholic education was not confined to elementary and high schools. In fact, he regarded normal school training as an important part of the overall process of preparation for Christian living. When he heard, in 1909, that agnostic views were being presented by instructors at the Calgary Normal School, he immediately complained to Premier Rutherford. Again, in 1912, he received news that a Normal School instructor, J.E. Loucks, "had made sarcastic remarks about the Catholic religion."[61] He raised the issue with the Minister of Education, Boyle, who instructed the Chief Inspector of the Department of Education and the Principal of the Normal School to investigate. This incident is an example of the zealous manner in which Legal attempted to advance the Catholic position. There was no statement forthcoming from the nuns who made the complaint and, when the investigators could find no grounds for the complaint, Legal was forced to apologize to Boyle and request the incident be forgotten.[62]

Because of Archbishop Legal's initiative, the Catholics of Alberta won several important concessions from the Alberta Liberal government and the University of Alberta Senate. All the concessions sought by Legal were in keeping with the Catholic theory of schooling. For example, the exchange of diplomas with the University of Alberta cleared up difficulties surrounding certification for Catholic religious and lay teachers who had received their training outside of Alberta. This ensured that Catholic children would continue to have teachers of their own faith. Requests for Catholic high schools, normal schools and a College affiliated to the University of Alberta were related to the theme of Catholic schooling for all Catholic children. The use of Catholic readers and text books would ensure that Catholic children received instruction that was in harmony with their faith. It can be concluded, therefore, that Legal's requests were definitely supportive of the Catholic perspective on schooling as enunciated by the Vatican.

Like the pontiffs and his fellow bishops, Legal believed that the church had the divine mission to educate:

> We depend on your better judgement that will make you understand that in these school questions, the religious authority has the right, and not only the right but the duty to make its voice sound in a not uncertain tone. In fact, the Church has always declared that the school is for her of paramount importance and very unwise be those who would not recognize it. Therefore, to touch our Catholic schools is to touch the apple of our eyes.[63]

This excerpt from a diocesan circular clearly indicates that Legal shared the views of Leduc, Grandin and Langevin concerning the role

of the church and the importance of Catholic schooling. However, he was realistic and realized that it was impossible to revert back to 1884. In view of this he compromised, rejected the confrontation approach and negotiated to attain concessions.

Like other members of the Oblate hierarchy, Legal supported the primary right of Catholic parents to choose the type of school their children should attend. In terms of Catholic parents in Alberta, Legal felt that they should not only be free to send their children to Catholic schools, but should also be able to request primary instruction in the French language. However, Legal and the other bishops never addressed the problem of Catholic parents sending their children to non-Catholic schools when a Catholic school was available.

The time prescribed for religious education was one of the issues raised by Legal. The Liberal education ministers with whom he negotiated did not agree to amend the existing legislation so that religious education could take place at a more conducive time of the school day than the last half-an-hour. Consequently, Legal did not make any other requests concerning the religious component of Catholic schooling. However, he never gave up his dream of Catholic schools in which the proper relationship between secular and religious education existed:

> We must ask freedom for our schools and educational institutions, where we must be able to give, besides the regular instruction on secular subjects, also a truly Christian education and the knowledge of religion, for religion must be at the base of all instruction, in a Christian society.[64]

Another issue that was of concern to Legal was French language education. The School Ordinance of 1892 had specified that English should be the sole language of instruction in the schools of the Territories. However, in that ordinance and the 1901 Ordinance, allowance was made for a primary course to be taught in French. This was interpreted to mean that children could be taught in French during the first year of school but, from the second year, English would be the sole language of instruction. Different interpretations of this clause were made by different inspectors and Franco-Albertans were afraid that, as time passed, all language rights would be lost in the schools of the West.

Rusak observed that "Legal approved the formation of the Societe de Parler Francais in the parishes of his diocese in preparation for a congress to be held in Edmonton on May 22, 1912."[65] He felt that there was growing animosity to French teaching in schools and was fearful of the outcome. In 1913, the Alberta French Canadian Association "passed a resolution to extend the influence of the French language through the schools."[66] This resolution was in opposition to the declaration of the Department of Education that English was the sole language of instruction in the schools. In June, 1915, Legal attempted to get a clearer definition of bilingualism and of Section 136 of the School Ordinance. The Department of Education adopted new regulations concerning second language instruction in May, 1916. The following is Section 19 of those regulations:

> Subject to the provisions of Section 136 of the School Ordinance, the board of any district may employ one or more competent persons to instruct the pupils attending school in any language other than English. Such instruction shall be given between the hours of three and four o'clock in the afternoon of such school days as may be selected by the board and shall be confined to the teaching of reading, composition and grammar. The text books used shall be those authorized by the Minister of Education.[67]

Legal was disturbed over the new regulations because the time prescribed for second language instruction conflicted with the half-hour set aside for religious instruction in Section 17 of the Alberta Act. In addition, the amendment had taken away French language privileges putting French on "an equal footing with all other languages."[68] Although he was unhappy with the new regulations Legal did not oppose them publicly. Most likely he felt that agitation on the part of the French-speaking Catholics could lead to further legislation that could be more disadvantageous to Catholic schooling.

The French language issue was directly related to the Catholic theory of schooling. As far as the Oblate hierarchy was concerned, language and faith were inseparable. Therefore, they regarded the imposition of English as the sole language of instruction in the schools as an infringement of parental educational rights. If parents were expected to ensure that their children learnt about their belief system and culture as French-speaking Catholics, then the French language should be part of the school curriculum.

Archbishop Legal worked diligently from 1905 to 1916 to gain further concessions as well as to maintain the existing Catholic school rights in the province of Alberta. From 1917, illness prevented him from directing too much attention to educational matters.[69] During his years of lobbying and negotiating, Legal achieved success in some of his areas of interest. He kept high school education under the control of the separate school boards; gained recognition for diplomas from the University of France; maintained French language instruction without departmental intervention; and succeeded in his quest to have a French Catholic school inspector appointed. He blessed the opening of the bilingual Jesuit College but was unable to realize his dream of a Catholic University or a Catholic College affiliated to the University of Alberta.

Legal's theory of schooling did not differ from that of Leduc, Grandin or Langevin. In fact, all these members of the Oblate hierarchy shared the following common views with regard to schooling: -- the church has the divine mission to educate; parents have the primary right to decide how their children should be educated; Catholic children should attend Catholic schools; the entire school day should be permeated by a Christian atmosphere; and there should be a balance between secular and religious training. They also expected that only religious and lay Catholic teachers would be employed to teach in Catholic schools. The Oblate hierarchy in the North-West Territories (1875-1905) and Alberta (1905-1920) did not develop a unique theory of schooling; their viewpoint on Catholic

schooling was derived from the papal pronouncements on education. It can be concluded, therefore, that the Oblate leaders in Alberta were influenced by the Vatican theory of Catholic schooling, endorsed the Vatican perspective and did not present any original views on schooling.

Conclusion

Catholic school rights in the North-West Territories changed considerably between the School Ordinance of 1884 and the Ordinance of 1892. By 1892, the dual system of education was replaced by a unitary system based on the Ryersonian model of Ontario. Further changes were made in 1901. Between 1893 and 1896, the Catholic hierarchy vigorously opposed the 1892 School Ordinance in an attempt to win back the rights they had enjoyed in 1884. Father Leduc was their chief spokesman at that time. They were fighting a losing battle for, by the 1890's, they were in the minority and the Protestant majority did not intend to give them special school rights.

After the papal encyclical Affari Vos Catholic leaders decided on a new course of action. The Pope had suggested that the Catholics in Manitoba accept the concessions they were granted by the Laurier-Greenway Compromise but continue to struggle to regain their lost privileges. In the North-West Territories, Bishop Grandin of St. Albert accepted this line of action and agreed that negotiation, rather than confrontation, would get the best results.

The major issues between 1902 and 1905 were provincial status and the school clauses of the Autonomy Bills for the creation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Catholic hierarchy welcomed the school clauses introduced by Laurier in February, 1905, because they were based on the dual system of education authorized by the North-West Territories Act of 1875. However, Protestant reaction and an imminent Cabinet split led to amendments that retained the school system as it had existed in 1901.

Bishop Legal's techniques of negotiations and compromise rather than confrontation between 1905 and 1920 in his relations with the Alberta Liberal Government are evidence of the changed role of the Catholic hierarchy in its struggle to gain concessions for the separate schools. However, the concessions he sought were similar to those that Father Leduc had been seeking in 1893-94. Bishop Legal's constant lobbying not only led to some minor concessions, but also helped Roman Catholics to retain separate school rights in the new province. Therefore, by 1920, Roman Catholic public and separate schools were an accepted part of the unitary school system of Alberta and dual education was a thing of the past.

Throughout the period 1875-1920, the Catholic theory of schooling remained unchanged. The basic principles or themes of the theory were enunciated by Pius IX and Leo XIII and reinforced by their successors. The papal pronouncements were endorsed by the Oblate hierarchy in the Diocese of St. Albert and subsequently, the Archdiocese of Edmonton. Archbishop Legal supported these themes just as Father Leduc and Bishop Grandin had done before him. He did

not differ from his predecessors over the theory but over the methods that should be employed to gain concessions from the state. Therefore, it can be concluded that, although the hierarchy differed over techniques to be used in negotiating with the government, the Catholic theory of schooling did not change. By 1905, Legal realized that the dual system of schooling of 1884 would not be reinstated in the short term. He, therefore, embarked on the only course he could pursue in those circumstances; he endeavoured to gain concessions for Catholic schooling through lobbying and patient negotiation. The Catholic theory of schooling was not modified. The Oblates had merely come to the realization that they would have to implement the Catholic theory of schooling as best as they could within the limitations imposed by a unitary school system with separate school privileges.

Footnotes

[1]M.R. Lupul, The Roman Catholic Church and the North-West School Question: a study in church-state relations in western Canada, 1875-1905. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974, p. 5. The major source of information for the period 1875-1905.

[2]Ibid.

[3]P. Duchaussois, Mid Snow and Ice: The Apostles of the North-West (translated by T. Dawson). Buffalo, New York: Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 348 Porter Avenue, 1937. p. 377.

[4]F.E. Banim, "The Centenary of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate," The Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report, 1941-42. pp. 29-33.

[5]D. Moniere, Ideologies in Ouebec: The Historical Development (translated by R. Howard) Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981. p. 137.

[6]R. Magnuson, A Brief History of Ouebec Education: From New France to Parti Ouebecois. Montreal: Harvest House, 1981. p. 30.

[7]J. Monet, "French-Canadian Nationalism and the Challenge of Ultramontanism." Canadian History before Confederation (J.M. Bumsted ed.) ed.) Georgetown: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972. p. 398.

[8]Moniere, op. cit. pp. 169-174.

[9]Lupul, op. cit. p. 5.

[10]Ibid. p. 3.

[11]L.A. Hochstein, "Roman Catholic Separate and Public Schools in Alberta," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1954. p. 10. This thesis describes the growth of the Catholic public and separate school system in Alberta from 1905-1953.

[12]Lupul, op. cit. p. 21.

[13]Ibid. p. 22.

[14]R.S. Patterson, "F.W.G. Haultain and Education in the Early West," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1961. p. 41.

[15]Ibid., p. 43.

[16]S.T. Rusak, "Relations in Education between Bishop Legal and the Alberta Liberal Government, 1905-1920," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1966, p. 8.

[17]Patterson, op. cit. p. 45.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid. p. 46.

[20]Lupul, op. cit. p. 79.

[21]Ibid. p. 89.

[22]H. Leduc, Hostility Unmasked: School Ordinance of 1892 of the North-West Territories and Its Disastrous Results. Montreal: C.O. Beauchemin and Son, 1896. Preface p. vi. Father Leduc was the most vocal defender of Catholic school rights during this period. Moreover, he worked tirelessly to oppose any move that he regarded as any infringement of Catholic school rights. His work was fully supported by Bishop Grandin of St. Albert and Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface.

[23]Ibid. p. 2.

[24]Ibid. p. 6.

[25]Ibid. p. 8. Leduc used the method of confrontation rather than negotiation. He made emotional accusations that could be easily denied by Haultain and Goggin.

[26]Ibid. pp. 8-14.

[27]Ibid. p. 15.

[28]Ibid. pp. 18-19. According to Leduc the priest resigned because he was not permitted to wear "the ecclesiastical costume of his church" and he had to be "entirely at the disposal of the Educational Department." In other words, he could not operate as an inspector and a priest at the same time. The duties of one position conflicted with those of the other.

[29]Ibid. p. 20.

[30]Ibid. pp. iii and iv, vii and viii. Archbishop Langevin made the following comment on Leduc's work: "Your work makes clear that the justice and fairplay, to which British subjects have a right, have been refused to some of them. You are therefore justified Reverend and dear Father, in protesting against so intolerable a state of things . . . With you I protest with all my might, as a citizen of the British Empire and as a bishop, against a state of things which is a violation of royal promises and of the most sacred of all liberties, liberty of conscience." Bishop Grandin congratulated Father Leduc on the completion of the task that he had imposed on him -- to write a treatise concerning the Catholic schools of the North-West. He had chosen Leduc for the task because he had always been interested in education and had served on the Board of Education. Grandin felt that an account of the

North-West school question was necessary so that it could be clearly understood that the end proposed by the North-West government was the same as that of Manitoba. He was pleased that Leduc had carried out his task with zeal and dedication.

[31] Ibid. pp. 31-39.

[32] Lupul, op. cit. p. 147.

[33] V. Grandin, Pastoral Letter, February 7, 1898. p. 2.

[34] Ibid. p. 3.

[35] Lupul, op. cit. p. 148.

[36] Ibid. p. 155.

[37] L.G. Thomas (ed.), The Prairie West to 1905. Toronto: Oxford University Press (Canadian Branch), 1975. p. 129.

[38] Lupul, op. cit. p. 219.

[39] Edmonton Journal, February 15, 1905.

[40] Ibid. February 28, 1905.

[41] A.O. MacRae, History of the Province of Alberta. Volume 1, Western Canadian History Company, 1912. p. 456.

[42] Journal, op. cit. April 11, 1905.

[43] Ibid. April 12, 1905.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid. April 24, 1905.

[46] Edmonton Bulletin. March 13, 1905. Since Haultain and the Superintendent of Education for the Territories, Goggin, were responsible for the change from a dual to a unitary system it is obvious that Haultain would oppose any school clauses designed to undo all that he and Goggin had accomplished between 1885 and 1901.

[47] Bulletin, op. cit. April 26, 1905.

[48] Rusak, op. cit. p. 15. Rusak suggested that Legal did not sign the document because he was of the opinion that Catholics had received all they could realistically expect. However, subsequent actions by Legal indicate that he was following Leo XIII's instructions (Affari Vos) to use the processes of lobbying and negotiation to regain some of the ground that had been lost.

[49]Lupul, op. cit. p. 205.

[50]Ibid. p. 206.

[51]Rusak, op. cit. p. 18.

[52]Lupul, op. cit. p. 208.

[53]Rusak, op. cit. p. 33.

[54]Ibid. p. 35. Throughout his negotiations with the Liberals between 1906 and 1916 Legal was unable to get his clause amended. The time prescribed for religious education continued to be the last half-hour of the school day.

[55]Ibid. p. 38. This meant that graduates of other Canadian universities as well as those from English and French universities were granted University of Alberta degrees without having to write any examinations once their qualifications were assessed and their course work accepted as equal to the requirements for a University of Alberta degree.

[56]Ibid. p. 39.

[57]Ibid. p. 49.

[58]Quoted by Rusak in his Master's thesis, op. cit. p. 89.

[59]Ibid. p. 53.

[60]Ibid. p. 71. The campaign for a French-Catholic inspector had started since Bishop Grandin was alive. Legal had worked tirelessly to gain this concession for approximately fourteen years.

[61]Ibid. p. 67.

[62]Ibid. p. 68.

[63]Lettres Circulaires de Monseigneur Emile J. Legal O.M.I. Archeveque D'Edmonton, Vol. II #7 June 11, 1916. p. 87.

[64]Ibid. Vol. II #15, October 6, 1918. pp. 195-196.

[65]Rusak, op. cit. pp. 75-76.

[66]Ibid. p. 92.

[67]Ibid. p. 93.

[68]Ibid. p. 94.

[69]Ibid. p. 85.

Chapter IV

Reaffirming Papal Directives -- The Theory of Schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton, 1921-1946

Introduction

Like their Oblate predecessors, the Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese, from 1921, accepted the papal position on schooling unquestioningly. H.J. O'Leary (1920-1938) and J.H. MacDonald (1938-1964) were the Archbishops of Edmonton from 1920 to 1964 and, as will be seen, they fully endorsed Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri (1929), the major papal directive for this period, in their pastorals and speeches.

As stated previously, five of the six major themes of the Catholic theory of schooling were already in place by 1921, having been enunciated by the Vatican and supported by the Canadian and American Catholic hierarchy. These themes outlined the church's divine mission to educate, parental responsibilities regarding schooling, the need for universal Catholic schools, the permeation principle of Catholic schooling and the relationship that should be maintained between academic and religious education. In previous chapters it has been found that the theory of Catholic schooling, as developed thematically by the popes, was adhered to by the Catholic community virtually without any overt dissent. Further, this theory did not change in the United States and Eastern Canada over the

period under study nor in the North-West Territories and Alberta between 1884 and 1920. In fact, the theory, enunciated by Pius IX and Leo XIII, was endorsed by their papal successors, the American and Canadian Catholic hierarchies and, more specifically, Catholic leaders in the North-West Territories (1884-1905) and Alberta (1905-1920). It will be seen that, between 1921 and 1946, the Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese continued to endorse papal pronouncements regarding schooling. However, some references were made to local problems such as finance and teacher recruitment. There was also some concern regarding French language instruction, particularly in the St. Albert school district. The religious leaders were also in the process of developing their response to progressive education. However, these local concerns did not conflict with papal schooling pronouncements. The religious hierarchy in Alberta consistently upheld the theory of Catholic schooling and had not yet demonstrated concern over the shortcomings of attempts at practical implementation of this theory.

In this chapter pastoral letters and speeches by bishops and archbishops within the Archdiocese of Edmonton and other parts of Alberta will be examined. These documents will be reviewed to determine whether the theory of schooling within the Archdiocese really did remain unchanged between 1921 and 1946 and whether the Vatican pronouncements on schooling were still accepted unquestioningly. Articles and reports in the Western Catholic will be examined for further elaboration of the theory and the Minutes

of Catholic school districts within the Archdiocese will be reviewed. Any school board discussions related to the Catholic theory of schooling or the need for more Catholic schools during this period will be analysed for evidence of trustee support of Vatican and hierarchical schooling pronouncements.

It is anticipated that an examination and analysis of these materials will assist in determining if the theory of schooling was unchanged in the Edmonton Archdiocese between 1921 and 1946. In addition, this evaluation will reveal whether the local Catholic leaders were expressing any new concerns which conflicted with that theory. References to papal statements, speeches and writings of American Catholic educational leaders and educational activities in other parts of Alberta and the rest of Canada will be examined to determine the extent of their influence on the views of Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Pastoral Letters and Speeches by Bishops and Archbishops

H.J. O'Leary, Archbishop of Edmonton from 1920 to 1938, was the first English-speaking prelate appointed to head the Archdiocese of Edmonton. Like his French-speaking predecessors, he supported the Catholic viewpoint that the church had a divine mission to educate. In a pastoral letter, prepared for reading in all churches and chapels of the Archdiocese on December 26, 1920, Archbishop O'Leary upheld the divine educative mission of the church:

> One of the great duties of the Episcopal office is to provide for the Christian education of His flock in obedience to the mandate of the Divine Master: "Going forth, teach all nations," "Teach the Gospel to every creature." The Bishop is also a ruler clothed with true authority, appointed to govern the Church of God.[1]

The Archbishop described his role as that of protector of the spiritual and moral welfare of his adherents. To fulfil this paternalistic role he would obviously have to be involved in decision-making concerning education because religious education and schooling could not be separated. In fact, all education was a preparation for man's final end, therefore, the church had an important role to play in the formal educational process.

O'Leary's views concerning the educative mission of the church were supported by J.H. MacDonald who became Archbishop of Edmonton after O'Leary's death in 1938. Like his predecessor, MacDonald endorsed the church's position regarding its role in education. In his pastoral of March 24, 1939 on Catholic youth organizations, MacDonald spoke of the church's role as an educator:

> There is nothing that the Church fears more than ignorance on the part of her people. She fears it on the part of others also; but she realizes that she is without defence when her own people are in that unfortunate position. She teaches that the talents given us by the Creator were meant for use and development, and that we cannot serve Him as we should unless we employ them to the best possible advantage. She has always been zealous in promoting educational and cultural activities. She has fostered the arts of music, painting, architecture and literature when there was very little to encourage her doing so.[2]

According to Archbishop MacDonald the church had never neglected its duty regarding the education of its supporters. Rather, it had

encouraged the development of expertise among its adherents in all areas of knowledge. The Archbishop added that people may be careless or indifferent about religion and education because of their preoccupation with economic problems and superficial types of entertainment. Nevertheless, he concluded that "experience has shown that all these defects can be corrected by right educational principles; and our duty should be to supply such principles.[3] He saw the educational role of the church as that of the master teacher who would provide the guidelines or principles which the teachers in the field would have to follow if Catholics were to be given the right kind of education. This was the typical position of Catholic spokesmen who assumed that if Catholic schools were available then everything else would progress smoothly.

Another theme addressed by Archbishop O'Leary was parental rights and responsibilities regarding the education of their offspring. In an address in Fort Saskatchewan in 1921, the Archbishop stressed the right of parents to determine how their children should be educated. He reminded his listeners that ". . . the child belongs primarily to the parents who brought it into the world. The first right therefore to educate the child is of the parent, not the state."[4] In his pastoral letter of February 2, 1923 his theme was the responsibilities of parents with regard to the temporal and spiritual development of their children. One of the obligations was to ensure that their children attended Catholic schools which would cater to their spiritual needs as well

as their educational requirements:

> Aussitôt que l'enfant à l'usage de la raison, c'est un devoir sacré pour les parents de voir à ce qu'il frequente régulièrement une école catholique. Les parents qui evoient leurs enfants a une école neutre ou sans Dieu, lorsqu'ils ont une école catholique a leur portée, péchent gravement et se rendent coupables d'une injustice criante envers ces jeunes âmes que Dieu leur à confiées.[5]

In other words, parents who neglected to send their children to Catholic schools, where these were available, were committing a grave injustice to their offspring. O'Leary added that Catholic parents should avoid sending their children to both neutral and anti-Catholic schools because an atmosphere of materialism and indifference permeated these institutions. It was because of these factors that "nous vous exhortons vivement, parents chrétiens à n'épargner aucun sacrifice, pour donner à vos enfants le bienfait de l'école catholique toutes les fois que la chose vous est possible."[6] This was in keeping with both the themes of parental responsibilities and Catholic schooling for Catholic children.

Archbishop O'Leary's comments regarding the educational rights and responsibilities of parents to their offspring were supported by Reverend J.J. D'Orsennens in an address to the Catholic Women's League in Edmonton on March 22, 1923.[7] Shortly after, in an address to Catholic teachers, Archbishop O'Leary outlined the duties of teachers but warned that:

> The teacher does not and cannot supplant the parent; nor can the school supplant the home. The Catholic Church holds that education is the function primarily of the home and the parent. The parent has the right of saying what kind of education the child shall receive.[8]

O'Leary described the relationship that should exist between the home and the school in an address to the Catholic Women's League Convention in Edmonton (1924). According to the Archbishop, the school comes next to the home and is merely an extension of the home.[9] It should not attempt to replace the home but should work with the home to inculcate Christian principles in the youth of the nation. He emphasized that Christian principles and a religious atmosphere should permeate both the home and the school. The responsibility of parents was to ensure that children were educated in an atmosphere that was conducive to the furthering of Catholic principles initially taught in the home. It should be noted that, throughout his episcopate, O'Leary steadfastly stressed the primary role of parents in determining the type of education their children should receive.

As previously mentioned, Archbishop O'Leary exhorted Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools wherever these were available. This was in keeping with the hierarchical position that Catholic children would receive the right kind of education once they attended Catholic schools. This viewpoint was also shared by O'Leary's successor, J.H. MacDonald.

It is evident from his pastoral letter of November 21, 1940 that Archbishop MacDonald recognized the far-reaching effects of the training obtained in childhood and adolescence. In that pastoral he reminded the religious community of the need for intelligent activity among Catholic youth:

> The character of our adult population a few years hence will depend on the homes and the schools and the various parish organizations that exercise an influence upon our youth during their formative years.[10]

MacDonald suggested that it was possible that many changes would take place in the world as a result of the Second World War. He recognized that the generation of young people of that day would be involved in implementing those changes and that Catholic youth would have a part to play in that process. Consequently, it was essential that they be given a Catholic education that would prepare them to take action that was in keeping with the principles of the Catholic faith.

MacDonald was aware that Catholic education had to continue beyond the schooling process if it was to be effective. He was, therefore, extremely supportive of St. Joseph's College, a Catholic institution established at the University of Alberta during the episcopate of Archbishop O'Leary. In 1925, when the campaign by leading lay and religious Catholics for the establishment of St. Joseph's was at its height, both Archbishop O'Leary and Bishop Kidd of Calgary were fully supportive of it. In a joint statement they advocated that a Catholic College on campus was necessary:

> If the Catholic youth of this province are to be afforded an opportunity for proper mental development, and adequately equipped to take their proper place in the community, and to exercise an effective influence in every field of endeavour.[11]

The role of St. Joseph's was to provide Catholic youth attending the University of Alberta with that kind of experience. Similar views were expressed by Archbishop MacDonald and Bishop Carroll nearly seventeen years later.

In a joint letter released on August 10, 1942, Archbishop MacDonald of Edmonton and Bishop Carroll of Calgary reminded pastors that they should inform prospective university students of their responsibilities as Catholics and of the spiritual and moral advantages of attending St. Joseph's College:

> St. Joseph's College, built and maintained by the Catholics of Alberta, is the official centre of Catholic life on the Campus. That the College may be in a position adequately to discharge its functions, it is necessary that all Catholic students, men and women alike, register at the College as soon as possible after their arrival in Edmonton. It is likewise our desire that all Catholic men attending the University, reside at St. Joseph's College. They will thus be able to avail themselves of the safeguards which the College provides for the continued practice of their religion amid the trials and dangers of University life.[12]

The above statement by MacDonald and Carroll was in keeping with the Catholic position that Catholic education was a life-long process that included preparation for the final end. Religious education should not be confined to the schooling process but should extend throughout the years of university training as well.

Although O'Leary and MacDonald did not specifically address the theme of permeation, their letters and speeches indicate that they assumed that permeation would take place in Catholic schools. For example, O'Leary's statement that Christian principles and a religious atmosphere should first permeate the home and then be extended to the school implies that the permeation principle should be operational in all Catholic homes and schools. MacDonald went even further for he suggested that the character of the future adult

Catholic population was dependent upon the homes, schools and parishes that influenced the formation of youth. Obviously MacDonald would also advocate that these institutions be permeated with a religious atmosphere.

Another theme of the Catholic theory of schooling was the relationship that should exist between intellectual and religious education in the schools. In an address to the Alberta School Trustees' Convention in 1931, Archbishop O'Leary concluded that intellectual education could not be separated from moral training or training of the will.[13] Similar views were expressed by Bishop Carroll of Calgary to the Catholic members of the School Trustees' Convention in 1938. Carroll reminded the Catholic trustees that Catholic schools should not be:

> Replicas of the public schools but should be definite training grounds for Catholic children -- not just schools where half-an-hour of Catechism is part of the curriculum but schools where the children are taught to put the Catechism into practice, in their religious duties and in the whole of their daily lives, even in the secular sections of their school work.[14]

In 1939, the Edmonton Separate school system celebrated its golden jubilee. In his letter to the administrators of the separate schools of Edmonton on that occasion, Archbishop MacDonald expressed gratitude to the pioneers of the system. He added that the church had made the choice to maintain Catholic schools in Edmonton long before the Edmonton Separate School Board had been established. That choice had been necessary because the church believed that man's soul as well as his body needed to be trained. Therefore, the church could not "recognize any educational system which even permits

the divorce of his spiritual education from that required for his social and economic life."[15] This statement was in keeping with the views expressed concerning the role of the church in education by his predecessor as well as the papal and other authorities examined in this study. Similar views were espoused by Bishop A. Jordan of Prince Rupert, who was to succeed MacDonald as Archbishop of Edmonton in 1964, at the opening of a school in Dawson Creek, British Columbia, in 1945. Jordan contended that a basic principle of right thinking was that the Christian and the man were inseparable and it was because of this principle that Catholic schools existed throughout the world:

> [Catholic schools] strive to cooperate with Divine Grace in forming the true and perfect Christian. They take in the whole complex of human life: physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual domestic and social in order to elevate, regulate and perfect it in accordance with the example of Jesus Christ.[16]

The above statements by Archbishops O'Leary and MacDonald and Bishops Carroll and Jordan were all supportive of the papal directive regarding the relationship that should exist between intellectual and religious/moral training in Catholic schools. Like their American and other Canadian counterparts, these Catholic leaders were not prepared to contemplate schooling without religion. For them, schools without religious education were unsuitable for Catholic children because religious instruction and education were inseparable in the Catholic theory of schooling.

Despite the fact that competent teachers are an important part of the educational system, very little was said by the

Archbishops about the characteristics of teachers. Since many of the teachers were from religious orders[17] it can be assumed that the leaders of the church in Edmonton felt that Catholic children would be exposed to good teaching, both intellectually and morally, once religious personnel were in control.

Archbishop O'Leary foresaw that there would be difficulties once lay teachers were employed purely on the basis of academic qualifications without considering their preparation for religious teaching. He raised this issue in his address to the Trustees' Convention in 1931. His suggestion was that trustees should seek other qualities, besides academic achievement, in the teachers they employed:

> To my mind, the first quality of a teacher is character. It is far more important than intellectual capacity -- necessary as this latter may be . . . The future welfare, therefore, of the children requires that in the employment of the teacher, the trustees should place good character and a sense of responsibility foremost amongst the necessary qualifications.[18]

O'Leary concluded that, since intellectual and moral/religious training could not be separated, trustees had to ensure that only individuals who understood this and were capable of undertaking this task were employed as teachers.

The views regarding schooling expressed by Archbishops O'Leary and MacDonald were similar to those of the American and Canadian Catholic leaders discussed in previous chapters. Moreover, they were supportive of the themes of the theory of schooling advocated by papal authorities. Both O'Leary and MacDonald supported

the papal pronouncements regarding the divine mission of the church, the need for Catholic schools for Catholic children and the relationship that should exist between intellectual and religious education. O'Leary re-emphasized the primary right and the responsibilities of parents in the educative process and expressed his views on the characteristics of teachers. Bishops Carroll and Jordan also shared the views of their superiors regarding the need for intellectual and moral/religious training in the schools. It can be concluded, therefore, that the spiritual heads of the Catholic church in Edmonton between 1921 and 1946 expressed views on schooling that were clearly a replication of the papal pronouncements as well as the American and Canadian sources discussed in previous chapters.

The "Catholic Truth Broadcast" was another forum by which the religious hierarchy made their educational views known to their adherents. These radio broadcasts were often reprinted in the Western Catholic, a major source of information regarding Catholic hierarchical views on schooling and other topics. In the next section "Catholic Truth Broadcast" materials, articles, editorials and other information regarding education, printed in the Western Catholic, will be reviewed.

Catholic Truth Broadcasts

The Western Catholic was an important source of information for this study. Besides reporting speeches made by Archbishops and bishops, this weekly newspaper provided copies of addresses

delivered on the "Catholic Truth Broadcast" programmes on CFRN radio station in Edmonton. Further, editorials and other articles contained other relevant information.

Educational and other addresses on the "Catholic Truth Broadcast" radio programmes were always presented by members of the clergy. The clerics who made the presentations were all advocates of religious education in the schools. The first address on the topic of religious education was given by Father L. Nelligan on Sunday, April 18, 1937. Nelligan's theme was the religious education of youth and he referred to the encyclicals Divini Ilius Magistri and Rerum Novarum in support of his theme. According to Nelligan, parents were not only responsible for early training but should also ensure that proper training continued "in another institution that is subsidiary and complementary to the home, and which is known as the school, and it follows logically and necessarily that here, too, religion must play a large part."[19]

The role of parents in education, discussed by Nelligan, was further elaborated by Father J.A. MacLennan in an address broadcast on April 7, 1940. MacLennan was also influenced by Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri:

> The home and school must work together in harmony and intelligent understanding if the child is to be educated in the truest and best sense of the word . . . It is readily apparent to us who have to do with youth in the schools that no institution outside the home can accomplish all that is demanded in a true education without the aid and cooperation of those God-given and natural forces in the work of education -- the parents of the children.[20]

Parents were, therefore, exhorted to take their role as the first educators of their children seriously and to continue this role

through active interest in their children's progress in school. In addition, they should support the school by being selective with regard to the reading materials that their children were exposed to in the home. This harmony between home and school was essential if children were to receive the right kind of education. Obviously, the right kind of education, as far as MacLennan was concerned, was Catholic schooling.

Another theme of the Catholic theory of schooling, discussed by Nelligan in his address referred to earlier, was the permeation principle of Catholic schooling. Nelligan referred to the work of Leo XIII in support of his position on permeation:

> Not only should Christian Doctrine have a place on the curriculum but the Christian spirit should extend to every branch of school work so that religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of the youth's entire training. As Leo XIII says in his encyclical, "Militanis Ecclesiae," "It is necessary not only that religious instruction be given to the young at certain fixed times, but also that every other subject taught be permeated with Christian piety."[21]

Nelligan's position was supportive of two of the themes of the Catholic theory of schooling -- the permeation principle as well as the necessity for maintaining a balance between intellectual and moral/religious training.

This theme was further discussed by Father MacLennan in a broadcast on April 14, 1940. The topic of that address was "The Catholic Church and Education." MacLennan began by reminding his listeners that the official position of the Catholic church regarding education could be determined by referring to the Code of Canon Law.[22] He stated that Canon Laws 1113, 1373 and 1374 provided

the basis of Catholic education and Catholic parents as well as teachers should keep that in mind. Education without religion was incomplete; this could be clearly seen in the public schools. In support of his viewpoint that the intellectual and moral aspects of education could not be separated, Father MacLennan referred to the educational views expressed by Calvin Coolidge, former president of the United States:

> There is something more in learning and something more in life than the mere knowledge of science, a mere acquisition of wealth, a mere striving for place and power. Our schools and colleges will fail in their duty to their students unless they are able to inspire them with a broader understanding of the meaning of science, the literature and the arts. Unless our scholarship, however brilliant, is to be barren and sterile, leading towards pessimism more emphasis must be given to moral power. Our schools and colleges must not only teach science but character. We must maintain a stronger, firmer grasp on the principle declared in the psalms of David and re-echoed in the proverbs of his son Solomon that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.[23]

MacLennan concluded that, even though Coolidge was not a Catholic, he had a profound sense of the need for basing all educational effort on God. He also suggested that the Catholic church had always been aware of that need and therefore insisted that religion be part of the curriculum of Catholic schools. To further reinforce his view that intellectual and moral education could not be separated, MacLennan referred to the address given by Archbishop O'Leary to the Alberta School Trustees' Association Convention in 1931.

The theme of the relationship between religious and intellectual education was further reinforced by MacLennan in a

broadcast the following week entitled "How Dangerous is a Godless Education?" MacLennan suggested that attempts were being made by evil dictators, such as Stalin and Hitler, to destroy religion, take away individual rights and impose totalitarian rule. Religious leaders had to ensure that the principles of democracy -- liberty, freedom, the right to life and the pursuit of happiness -- were not sacrificed on the altar of cold materialism.[24] Educational leaders had to face up to their responsibilities and resist godless education lest they barter away religious education "for the mess of pottage which the peoples of Russia and Germany have to their shame and sorrow accepted."[25] MacLennan was definitely supportive of the Catholic hierarchical position that schooling without religious education was incomplete.

In an address on January 8, 1939 Father E. Donahoe spoke on the topic "Religious Education in the Home." Donahoe began his address by providing an answer to the question "What is Education?":

> The obvious answer is: education is a preparation for life. But it is equally obvious that this preparation extends to include the whole life of man; his life here, and his life hereafter.[26]

Like Nelligan and MacLennan, Donahoe referred to Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri to support his arguments. The view of education as a preparation for life here and hereafter was one of the basic tenets of Catholic doctrine throughout the ages. However, it became commonly known and accepted by Catholic spokesmen as a result of Pius XI's encyclical.

"The Religious Role in Education" was the topic of an address by Father C.J. Foran less than a month after Donahoe's

broadcast. Foran reinforced the views expressed by Donahoe. Further, he blamed lack of faith, the belief that progressive education would have provided a panacea for all the problems faced by educators and the modern philosophy of materialism and individualism for the disordered state of the world.[27] It should be noted that, in 1939, when Donahoe and Foran were making their presentations, the threat of the Second World War was imminent. By 1940, when MacLennan was giving his broadcasts, the Second World War was underway. Like many religious spokesmen of his day, Foran blamed a radical trend away from Christian ideals for the aggressive materialism and intolerant attitudes of people in the civilized world. He was convinced that an education based on Christian principles would better prepare youths to resist the evils of selfishness and greed that were threatening the foundations of modern civilization. This was as true of Edmonton as of all the other cities in the modern world. Similar views were expressed by MacLennan in 1940. However, he was more specific for he referred to Stalin and Hitler as two of the greatest threats to individual rights and religious education. Because of the attitude to religious education taken by these two dictators, MacLennan, like other Christian leaders of his time, used whatever public forums were available to condemn totalitarianism and re-emphasize the importance of religious education of youths.

The clerics who gave the radio broadcasts on Catholic educational issues all supported the basic tenets of the Catholic theory of schooling. They addressed issues such as parental

educational rights, the role of religion in education, and the importance of Catholic schooling for Catholic youths. They reiterated the views of Pius XI as outlined in Divini Ilius Magistri, the encyclical that re-emphasized pronouncements made by Pius IX and Leo XIII as well as their predecessors. Foran introduced a new theme, that will be further developed in the next chapter, when he referred to the role of progressive education in Alberta. Apart from Foran's reference to progressive education, their position was the same as that of the spiritual heads of the Catholic church in the Archdiocese of Edmonton. In the next section views of religious and lay Catholics concerning schooling that were printed in the Western Catholic during this period will be discussed. It is anticipated that the educational views of these Catholic spokesmen will be similar to those expressed by the spiritual leaders of the Archdiocese.

Western Catholic Materials

The first edition of the Western Catholic, a newspaper printed for circulation to Catholics in the Archdiocese of Edmonton and the Diocese of Calgary, appeared on June 23, 1921. Between 1921 and 1946 there were three editors. J.W. Hefferman, a layman, was the first; he was succeeded by Father J.A. MacLennan in 1926. By 1934, Father R.V. Britton had replaced MacLennan.

The editorials of the Western Catholic provided information regarding the methods used by Catholic leaders to maintain interest in Catholic schooling. Whether editorials on schooling were used as

reminders to Catholics of their duty to ensure that their children attended Catholic schools or as commentaries on actions by Catholic educators in the United States, they served the basic purpose of reinforcing the Catholic theory of schooling.

The themes of Catholic educational theory reinforced in these editorials were the roles of the Church, school and parents in schooling, Catholic children in Catholic schools and the relationship between intellectual and moral/religious education. The basis of a Catholic education system and the mission of the Catholic school were outlined in the August 22, 1929 editorial:

> The Catholic educational system is based upon God and the things of the life eternal. The Church considers that without an early training in faith and morals, the spiritual life is starved . . . The mission of the Catholic school is to interpret education according to the Christian concept of life, to lead children to the knowledge and love of God.[28]

As previously mentioned, the encyclical Divini Ilius Magistri was regarded as a major contribution to Catholic educational theory by Catholic leaders throughout North America. It was not surprising, therefore, that the full text of the English translation of that document appeared in the pages of the Western Catholic during February, 1930. On February 6, the editor described the encyclical as "a forceful and trenchant statement from the Vicar of Christ setting forth the teaching of Holy Mother the Church on the all-important question of education."[29] He then summarized the salient features of the encyclical.

The importance of religion in education and the shortcomings of a neutral education were often used as themes for editorials.

In one of these, religion was described as "the mightiest lever in the world for the uplift of mankind" and parents were warned against neutral education which "neglected the primary end in the training of the child."[30] Catholic educational leaders claimed that they differed somewhat from their secular counterparts in defining the purpose of education. The Catholic hierarchy, represented by Western Catholic editor MacLennan, provided the following definition of the purpose of education:

> The essential purpose of education should be more than merely an apprenticeship to occupations that are overcrowded. Mere multiplication of teaching accessories will not give real education. It is necessary to do deeper and "to become clear as to the meaning of life" . . . The Catholic child knows that the accumulation of wealth and the search for early pleasure is not the purpose of life. He sees a higher motive and is taught to guide his conduct not by the pagan principle of "getting away with it" but by keeping the commandments of God.[31]

In the January 22, 1925 edition of the Western Catholic statements made at the Catholic Education Association of Pennsylvania Conference concerning the need to blend secular education with religious and moral training were quoted and endorsed by the editor. Later in the year, another editorial referred to the Conference of the Catholic Education Association of the United States. On that occasion, the editor made a stirring appeal for the formation of an Alberta Catholic Education Association and suggested that Catholics in Alberta should follow the example of their brethren to the south regarding the advancement of the cause of Catholic education.[32] No action was taken to form the association at that time. In the editorial of the January 28, 1926 Western

Catholic, a Catholic school system was described as "a system strictly in accord with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, a system in which not only the intellectual and physical welfare of the children is attended to but the moral welfare as well."[33] Less than a month later, another editorial on religion and education appeared:

> The Church in insisting on religious education takes into account the whole man -- not only man's body but his soul; not only the present but the future. Pernicious indeed, the Church holds, is the education which ignores religion, stifles the noblest aspirations of the human heart, and blinds the human intellect to those interests which as one writer has it, "give to man his real dignity and to human life its meaning."[34]

In 1934 Father Britton became editor of the Western Catholic. In an editorial, written to coincide with the end of the school year in 1936, he reiterated the views expressed by his predecessors regarding the roles of the church, parents and school in the educational process.[35] In other editorials, such as that of September 5, 1934, he exhorted Catholic parents to ensure that their children attended Catholic schools. He referred to statements by the Bishop of Seattle and the Archbishop of Edmonton to support his premise that all Catholic children should attend Catholic schools.[36] This position was reinforced in another editorial at the beginning of the 1936-37 school year advocating that every Catholic child should be in a Catholic school:

> The only place for the Catholic child is the Catholic school. We have no quarrel with the public school system of this province. We admire the work done in the public schools with non-Catholic children but still we maintain that the only place for the Catholic child is the parish school.[37]

In subsequent editorials between 1937 and 1946, published to coincide with the beginning of the school year, the recurring themes were the importance of Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri to Catholic educational theory; the educational rights of parents; the necessity for all Catholic children to attend Catholic schools; and the need for religious education in the schools. The need for cooperation between home and school was also emphasized. The following statement is an adequate summary of the main themes expressed:

> The home, the Church and the school are the three great training grounds for the child of today and the citizen of tomorrow . . . We Catholics know that while we build churches in order that God may be worshipped, we build and conduct Catholic schools in order that God may have worshippers . . . It cannot be too often repeated that every Catholic child has a sacred right to an education conducted under Catholic auspices, and that it is the duty of Catholic parents to safeguard that right.[38]

The editorial columns of the Western Catholic continually reinforced the views of the Catholic hierarchy regarding Catholic schooling. This official organ, circulated to the parishes and homes of the Archdiocese, was a useful vehicle for putting forward the educational goals of the church. It should be noted that the opinions regarding the essentials of Catholic schooling and the roles of the parent, the church and the school in this process, that were expressed by the editors, reflected prevailing Catholic views. In one editorial a new theme was raised -- that accumulation of wealth and the search for early pleasure was not the Catholic purpose of life. However, this theme was not repeated in any subsequent editorials. It can be concluded, therefore, that the

Catholic leaders in the Edmonton Archdiocese were united in their concerns regarding Catholic schooling. Moreover, their concerns coincided with those of the Vatican, the American Catholic hierarchy and other Canadian Catholic leaders.

Western Catholic articles and reports concerning schooling were not confined to reports of official educational pronouncements by the religious hierarchy and editorials on schooling. There were numerous other articles and reports by clerical and lay educators that discussed the educational issues raised by the spiritual leaders of the Edmonton Archdiocese. Some of these were locally prepared materials while others were commentaries or reports of activities by Catholics in the United States or elsewhere.

Among the topics discussed in these articles and reports were: the Catholic theory of schooling or philosophy of education; the roles of the church and school in education; the educational responsibilities of parents; the necessity of blending religious and intellectual learning in the classroom; the permeation principle of Catholic schooling; teacher education; and the role of the Catholic press.

In the paper "Catholic Students," printed in the Western Catholic on February 18, 1931, Father J.J. Bergin described education as "the harmonious development of the whole man." He then proceeded to define the Catholic philosophy of education:

> The philosophy, then, which is to be the foundation of true education must furnish right and definite answers to the question of man's origin, dignity, and destiny. It must hold that man is made up of a body and immortal soul; that he owes his highest allegiance to God . . . [therefore] if Christ is the

> foundation and centre of Christian life, he must be made the foundation and centre of Christian education.[39]

Professor W.H. Downey of Notre Dame University, Indiana, provided further argument in favour of the Catholic theory of education:

> In the Catholic theory education is development and discipline of mind and will, rather than mere learning. The aim of such education is to cultivate habit and mind, which for want of a better word may be called philosophical, to enlarge the intellect, to develop in harmony all of the human faculties, to give man a comprehensive view of things and their relations, to make him see clearly amid the masses of human error and human passions.[40]

Downey added that, in this theory, education was not mere knowledge but a combination of knowledge and Christian principles.

The aims and scope of Catholic education were outlined by Reverend Dr. D.M. Galliher of Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Connecticut, in an address to the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) of the United States. A Western Catholic report of the address quoted Galliher as stating that "the true aim and deepest concern of Catholic teaching has ever been in the past, as even now it is, to teach our growing youth the art of complete and wholesome living."[41] In keeping with this aim, Galliher noted Catholic educators welcome scientific discoveries and improved pedagogical methods and have always been "willing to advance with the discoveries of the time, so long as these progressions make for an intellectual improvement that does not thwart the supreme concern of humanity."[42] Dr. Galliher concluded that Catholic schools and post-secondary institutions were the only institutions in the world that fearlessly taught about man's sacredness, his origin and destiny.

He added that this should continue to be a priority of Catholic educators as it has always been in the past.

The divine educational mandate of the church was closely connected to the Catholic theory of education and the place of religious instruction in the school curriculum. In a sermon at St. Peter's church, Edmonton, in July 1934, Father J. O'Hara reminded his listeners of the church's divine mandate to teach and outlined the Catholic interpretation of education:

> To the Catholic Church the true meaning of education is that which pertains to eternal salvation. To the Catholic Church the true meaning of education is that which teaches man to know, love and serve Almighty God, an education that develops the mind, the senses and the will.[43]

He acknowledged that parents were the first educators and that they had delegated that authority to the teachers in the schools. He, therefore, urged parents to cooperate with teachers so that the aims of Catholic schooling could be fulfilled.

The presentation "Catholic Education," taken from the sermons and addresses of Cardinal J. O'Connell of the United States, was reprinted in the November 18, 1931 edition of the Western Catholic. In discussing the role of the church in education, O'Connell stated that teaching was not isolated from the general work of the church but was rather part of the church's sacred mission to educate. This mission had been originally entrusted to the apostles and after that to their representatives -- the bishops of the church. O'Connell agreed that education was a preparation for life, but maintained that the Catholic concept of life differed from that of the proponents of neutral or godless schools:

> It is principles, principles, principles, the foundation stones of life which are needed today. The mere glow of satisfaction which comes on the day of graduation is soon dissipated in the rough and tumble of life, unless those principles of the moral and intellectual order are laid so deep and strong that even if for a moment they are slightly disturbed they can never be really moved or shaken.[44]

In other words, education without moral principles, as defined by the Catholic church, was of little value as a preparation for life.

Parental duties and responsibilities in education was a theme that was discussed by many of the speakers and writers quoted in the Western Catholic. On February 11, 1926, a sermon delivered by Father Simon at St. Joseph's Cathedral, Edmonton, the previous Sunday was printed in the Western Catholic. The topic of the address was child-training. Simon reminded parents of their role in this process and of the importance of starting this training early:

> The education of the child is the chief duty of the parents. The object of this education should be to prepare him to take his place among his fellowmen and that by doing so he may sanctify and save his soul . . . the early years are of great importance in the training of character. Let parents neglect this period . . . it matters not with what zeal they labour in after years, the result will never be so perfect as it might have been.[45]

An article entitled "Parents and Education" written by Benedict Elder of the United States was printed in the Catholic Women's page of the Western Catholic on August 29, 1934. Elder referred to Pius XI's answer to Mussolini regarding the educational rights of parents and the Oregon versus the Sisters of Charity decision handed down by the United States Supreme Court on the same issue.[46] Both the pope and the judge maintained that parents had

the right to decide how their offspring would be educated. Elder concluded that the parents' right to direct the education of their children was clearly upheld by both the authority of the Church and the Supreme Court of the United States. Catholic parents, therefore, had a duty to ensure that their children attended Catholic schools; if they neglected this duty then they were failing in their responsibilities to their children.

The views expressed by Simon and Elder were repeated in the column "God and Your Child" by Dr. M.C. McGrath on July 21, 1937. According to McGrath the Christian home has the natural duty of educating the child and parents should endeavour to carry out that sacred duty to the best of their ability. McGrath quoted from the Code of Canon Law to support her position on the educational duties of parents.[47] She added that it would be futile to expect parents to cater to all the details of their children's educational needs. However, once they fulfilled their obligation to send their children to Catholic schools, their efforts in that direction would be reinforced by the teachers in those schools.

The column "This Changing World" was occasionally used for commentaries on education by religious personnel. In an article on the "Parents' Role in Education," Father C.J. Foran reminded parents that, when they send their children to school, they were merely delegating their primary educational responsibility to the teachers:

> The educating of the children God has entrusted to parents is primarily the responsibility of the parents themselves. It is only by delegation that this obligation is passed on to the teachers in

> the school . . . although the actual teaching of children has passed from the hands of parents, they still have a very definite role to play in the educating of their children.[48]

In other words, Catholic parents who felt that their educational responsibilities ended when they placed their children in a Catholic school were failing to exercise their duties effectively. Their educational responsibilities included cooperation with the school and teachers by ensuring that their children were punctual, completed their homework assignments, accepted responsibility and exercised respect for their elders as well as the property of others. According to Foran, parents who neglected these responsibilities were failing in their educational duties to their children. In another article in the same column two years later, Foran again stressed the need for cooperation between parents and the school. He suggested that if parents did not cooperate with the teachers:

> . . . the child's progress in school is likely to be very limited. In almost every instance where a child is having difficulties at school the fault lies in the home. Parents are not fulfilling their part of the educative contract.[49]

The right of parents to decide what type of education their children should have was re-emphasized in a brief on "Youth and Education" presented to the Provincial Youth Commission by the Calgary Catholic Youth Organization in June 1944:

> We also take it as a principle that the duty and right to educate belongs in the first place to parents. The state has the high honor and duty to assist parents in the education of their children; never to supplant them.[50]

The Catholic youth of the Diocese of Calgary argued that the state should not impose its will in educational matters unless it was

necessary to do so in the interest of civil affairs. In all other aspects, the parents' educational rights should never be superseded by those of the state.

The position of Catholic leaders with reference to the parents' role in education was adequately summarized by Reverend E. Schmiedeler in an article entitled "Home, School and Co.":

> The prime principle that must be kept in mind at all times with regard to the relationship of home and school is that the former is really the school of schools while the latter is merely an extension of the home or an adjunct thereof.[51]

He added that parents should accept their share of the responsibilities for child care and training and not expect the teachers to assume their roles. Similarly, teachers should not attempt to shoulder the responsibilities of parents:

> What is needed of course is not a shifting of parental tasks to the shoulders of the school and teacher, but a closer and more helpful cooperation between school and home. This demands a closer relationship and closer contact between parent and teacher.[52]

Another recurring theme of the Catholic theory of schooling was the importance of religious education. This theme was often discussed together with the permeation principle of Catholic schooling. In discussing religion and education, Father Bergin noted that the Catholic religion was not "a thing apart" from other pursuits of life:

> Its principles and its spirit, if they are to bear fruit worthy of man and His Maker, must permeate and rule the whole man in all his activities. They must extend to philosophy, the arts, to the sciences, to all the professions, they must give tone to public life and to private life, they must exert their influence in the common-place activities of family life and of school life.[53]

Bergin concluded that the church had a solemn duty to ensure that education in Christian principles permeated the school system so that children could be exposed continually to eternal truths governing man's existence.

Bergin's position regarding the role of religion in education was reinforced by an article entitled "Catholic Education -- The Need of the Hour" that appeared in the Western Catholic on August 29, 1934.[54] Similar views were also expressed by Reverend Father J.A. MacLennan in "The Blindspot in Education" approximately three years after Bergin. According to MacLennan, "religion is always part and parcel of Catholic education. The Church is insistent that God is the be-all and end-all of human life."[55] Further reinforcement of this position was provided in "The Spirit of Catholic Education," an article that appeared in September, 1935.[56] The writer of that piece not only reiterated the Catholic position regarding religion and education but also supported the Catholic theme of Catholic schools for all Catholic children.

A quotation from Dr. C. Gray, Head of the Department of Philosophy of New York University, was used by the writer of the column, "Things Catholics are asked about," to add credence to the Catholic position regarding the integration of religious and intellectual education:

> Religion and education should go hand in hand to achieve the final goal of a life better fitted for success. I find the greatest men in the greatest fields devoutly religious . . . Religion is necessary and should find a place in every educational institution from the primary school to the university, throughout the land.[57]

A statement by J.C. Hayes, Professor of History at Loyola College, in which he pleaded for education of the spiritual as well as the temporal man, was reprinted from the Chicago Daily News in the August 11, 1937 edition of the Western Catholic to further reinforce the views expressed by Catholic leaders in Edmonton. It is apparent that Catholic educational leaders in Edmonton were keenly interested in events affecting Catholics in the United States and referred to statements of American Catholic leaders in support of their viewpoint..

The importance of religion in the schools was also stressed by the Catholic Youth Organization of Calgary. In their brief, referred to earlier, they contended that education without religion was meaningless:

> That religion should be an integral, indeed, a prime element in education is a conviction that we hold most strongly; for man's true worth is measured by his moral stature and not merely by his mental attainments. Thus, a general religious outlook should pervade the whole school-day and ministers of religion should be given the opportunity during school hours to teach formal religion according to the creed which the various pupils profess . . .[58]

Further reinforcement of this position was provided by Brother Ephrem of St. Joseph's College, Edmonton, in an article entitled "Education, Old and New." Ephrem's commentary was one of a series of articles on Catholic education printed in the Western Catholic in 1943. He reminded readers that, in Catholic schools, education consisted of more than acquisition of knowledge:

> [It embraced] the transmission to our younger generation of our Catholic heritage, a true Christian culture . . . the Catholic teacher considers it a sacred duty to train the character of the young one in accordance with the maxims of the gospel. In the Catholic school, whether the subject being studied be mathematics or science, history or literature, sociology or psychology, the pupil is constantly imbibing a knowledge of the mores, the attitudes, the aspirations, the legends, the habits and practices that make up our Christian culture.[59]

Brother Ephrem's statement is an adequate summation of the place of religion in Catholic schooling enunciated by the Vatican and supported by the North American religious hierarchy.

Some of the columnists in the Western Catholic were also concerned about the role and function of the Catholic school and the training of Catholic teachers. For example, in a column on "Christian Education" in 1941, the writer discussed the function of the school as an extension of the family.[60] That column was, in effect, a summary of articles in the current issue of Blackfriars, a Catholic monthly printed at Oxford. The theme of that issue of Blackfriars was the "Problem of Christian Education." The school was said to be operating legitimately if it was an extension of the family that provided an educational superstructure that the family desired, but was not qualified to impart. With reference to the question of freedom and authority, it was recommended that the right balance between those two extremes had to be found by school authorities.

Brother Azarius of St. Joseph's College, Edmonton, also discussed the function of the Catholic school in an article printed on May 12, 1943:

> The Catholic school must fit its graduates not only to give reasons for the faith that is in them; not only to be well-instructed in the belief and practices of Catholicism. It must do all this and more. It must send them forth imbued with an enthusiasm for their faith and a keen awareness of the implications of that faith in the political, economic, and social world that surrounds them.[61]

The Catholic school was, therefore, regarded not only as an extension of the family but also as an extension of the church. The function of the school was to carry out the educational mandate of the church as well as cater to the demands of Catholic parents regarding their children's education.

For the school to fulfil its function as an extension of the home and the church teachers had to be properly prepared. The importance of properly trained teachers with a thorough foundation of Catholic principles and practices was emphasized in a column on "Catholic Teacher Education" in the June 9, 1943 Western Catholic.[62] The writer stated that British and American Catholic leaders, recognizing the desirability of that objective, had provided Catholic Teacher Training Colleges in those two countries. In those institutions deficiencies in previous religious training were remedied and further study of Catholic philosophy was undertaken. It should be noted that, since the time of Archbishop Legal, Catholic leaders in Edmonton had been lobbying for a Catholic normal school for Catholic teacher preparation. Although little was said about this during the period 1921 to 1947 the issue had not been dropped. This will become evident when submissions to the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta are discussed in the next chapter.

Experiments with progressive educational techniques and curricula were taking place in Alberta in the late 1920's and early 1930's. These experiments were opposed by Catholic leaders who embraced traditional or essentialist educational principles rather than the pragmatism and naturalism of progressive education. In 1936, a new curriculum was introduced in Alberta schools that was heavily influenced by the progressive ideology of John Dewey and his supporters in the United States. Progressive education had been introduced in the United States by the turn of the century; therefore, criticisms of this educational theory had been made by American Catholic leaders even before Alberta began its experiments in applying this theory.

Between December 1932 and January 1933 the Western Catholic carried a series of articles by Reverend Dr. E.B. Jordan, Professor of Education at the Catholic University, Washington D.C. on "Christian Education." According to Jordan, progressive educational axioms such as learning through activity and respect for the personality of the child were nothing new as far as Catholic educational theory was concerned. Since the 1850's, the French educator Bishop Dupanloup had stated that the child could not be taught without his cooperation and against his will. Further, Dupanloup had concluded that, after twenty-five years of devotion to education "the greatest lesson I have learned and the deepest conviction I have gained is a feeling of profound respect for the child."[63] Jordan suggested that the difference of opinion between Catholic and progressive educators was not over learning through activity and respect for the child, but over the issue of freedom

and authority. Catholic teachers should not be influenced by the modern insistence on complete freedom of the child which will ultimately defeat the purpose of education but should find a "via media."

Jordan referred to the statement of the German writer, Dr. T. Litt, in which educators were warned of the danger of allowing the child too much freedom to pursue his own interests:

> A system of education that even with the best intentions in the world, would do no more than follow the inclinations and desires of the child, answer all his questions and satisfy his instinctive craving for activity, would be, so far as results are concerned, nothing short of barbarism.[64]

In view of this, Jordan reminded teachers of their role as representatives of the church, parents and society. Teachers should allow their pupils a certain amount of freedom but, at the same time, they should not let them forget that the teacher was the authority figure in the classroom.

In the second article of the series, Jordan noted that Catholic educators supported modern demands for character training as these demands were in keeping with the Catholic premise that education involved the training of the whole person. He described Pestalozzi and Herbart as "two representative Protestant educators who always insisted upon the necessity of moral training in the education of children."[65] Their position was similar to that of Catholics who contend that moral/religious and intellectual education must both be present in the curriculum.

Jordan did not condemn progressive educational theory in its entirety. He felt that some of the themes of progressivism

were acceptable while others were not. He suggested that the issues of freedom and authority and the place of moral/religious instruction in the classroom were the main areas of difference between Catholic traditionalists and modern progressivists. It was essential, therefore, that Catholic educators work towards the "via media."

The final topic addressed in the Western Catholic articles and reports was the role of the Catholic press in education. A speech by J.J. Quinn, President of the Catholic Press Association, was reproduced in the August 21, 1935 edition of the Western Catholic. Mr. Quinn's comments are discussed here because of their relevance to an understanding of the role of the press in furthering the cause of Catholic schooling.

Quinn's description of the role of the church in education was similar to that of the religious hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese. He commended the Catholic church for its defence of the rights of parents to control the education of their children and added that Catholic schools resulted from 1900 years of experience in the field of education.[66] Quinn described the church as "the divinely appointed teacher of men" and the "true source of inspiration of education."[67] Quinn contended that the Catholic press was often the only medium supplying information regarding the Catholic viewpoint on schooling, legislation and other related topics. In addition, the Catholic press was actively involved in promoting education since "it has fulfilled this mission for decades of years by pointing out to parents the necessity and duty

of sending their children to a Catholic school and urging higher education."[68] It should be noted that Quinn's position regarding the educational role of the press has been substantiated by the research of educational materials printed in the Western Catholic undertaken in this study.

The Western Catholic materials reviewed here provided relevant information concerning the theory of schooling espoused by the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese as well as the external sources they used to support their position. The basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling such as the role of the church; the educational rights of parents; the necessity of blending religious and intellectual instruction; the permeation principle of Catholic schooling; the role of the school; and the need for properly trained Catholic teachers were reemphasized in the pages of the Western Catholic. Critiques of progressive educational theory were also presented. The Catholic press was clearly the official organ of the hierarchy and played its part in furthering the cause of Catholic schooling. Besides the fact that most of the materials were written by religious leaders, two outstanding members of the religious hierarchy in Edmonton served as editors of the Western Catholic for approximately twenty of the twenty-five years of the period studied. In addition, lay Catholic writers supported the views expressed by the hierarchy in their articles or speeches. In the next section the deliberations of groups of mainly lay Catholics with leadership roles in schooling will be examined. The purpose of this is to ascertain whether lay Catholic spokesmen

supported the views of the hierarchy regarding schooling.

According to Cashman, Catholic trustees in Edmonton "were 'elected' in a merely technical sense because the Archbishop felt a pastoral responsibility to appoint them."[69] This was true of trustee elections in the Archdiocese throughout the period studied in this chapter. The trustees, whether elected by a show of hands or appointed by the Archbishop, were delegated the responsibility of determining policy in their school district. Except for Edmonton, where the Separate School Board employed a Catholic school superintendent, the superintendents of schools were provincial employees who were only concerned with secular educational aims. The trustees of the various districts did not examine the practical implementation of the Catholic theory of schooling. Their task was to implement general policy for the district.

Minutes of Catholic School Board Meetings

An examination of the Minutes of St. Albert Public and the Edmonton, Red Deer, Wainwright and Vegreville Separate School districts that were within the boundaries of the Edmonton Archdiocese revealed very little about the practical application of the Catholic theory of schooling. The chairmen of the boards and the trustees were faced with administrative problems such as hiring of teachers, discipline in schools, building new schools, repairs to existing buildings and sources of finance. Therefore, they concentrated on grappling with those practical issues and did not engage in discussions on the theoretical basis of Catholic

schooling. Occasionally, there were references to religious education in the schools. However, the attitude of the members of the various school boards seemed to be that, once religious personnel were assigned to teach in the schools, children would receive the necessary religious instruction in a religious atmosphere. Religious in this context referred to a professed member of a Catholic religious community.

A discussion and motion at the July 19, 1929 meeting of the Edmonton Separate School Board indicated that members felt that religious teachers were more suitable for Catholic schools:

> Before coming to the appointment of teachers a discussion took place as to the proportion of religious and lay teachers that should be maintained in the schools, after which it was moved by Mr. Pillon that the number of religious and lay teachers on the staff be in the proportion of two religious to one lay teacher as near as may be possible.[70]

No reason was given for this desired proportion. However, it can be assumed that the trustees were of the opinion that religious educators were needed to ensure that the religious aspect of schooling was not neglected.

At another meeting of the Edmonton Separate School Board in 1931, the superintendent reported that Father Ingoldsby had been transferred to Toronto and, despite efforts by the superintendent and some board members, they had been unable "to secure a Religious teacher for the position."[71] Government policy regarding the requirements for teacher certification was another topic discussed by the Edmonton Separate School Board. At a meeting in April 1937, the trustees decided that, in view of the government policy on certification, applications from religious teachers would only be

accepted if they met the official requirements for certification. This was an important decision for it meant that religious personnel would no longer be given special status by the Edmonton Separate School Board. The trustees also stated that teachers from religious orders who were already employed would be expected to meet the requirements within a reasonable time.[72]

Religious education in schools was still a prominent issue in the 1940's. At the April 8, 1940 meeting of the Edmonton Separate School Board members were informed that the Teachers' Association had requested that there should be a standard religious education course in the schools and that there should be a refresher course for teachers in September. In view of this, Mr. Crowe, one of the trustees, moved that "the Superintendent be requested to interview the Archbishop in regard to these requests and that the proposal be given the endorsation of the Board."[73] It can be assumed that the Archbishop agreed to the proposal because, at the November 18, 1940 meeting of the Board:

> It was reported by the Superintendent that on six successive Sunday forenoons during the months of October and November, the teachers had participated in a refresher course in Religious Education at the F C J [Faithful Companions of Jesus] Convent under the direction of Father Holland of the St. Joseph's Seminary Staff [St. Albert]. It was further reported that the course had been entirely successful, due largely to the efforts of Father Holland.[74]

The issue of Catholic textbooks for use in Catholic schools, which had been raised since Legal's episcopate, was an item at the Edmonton Separate School Board meeting of May 15, 1944. Board members were informed that a request would be made shortly to the

Department of Education "that the Faith and Freedom and Corona Catholic Readers be authorized for use in the Catholic schools and provided free of charge by the Department in place of basic readers."[75] Mr. Gallant moved that the board support the proposal and the motion was carried unanimously.

Although Edmonton Separate School Board members did not make direct references to the theory of Catholic schooling, they supported Catholic educational ideals. The function of the school board was to ensure that the business of the school district was carried out efficiently. However, they still insisted on religious education and regarded religious teachers and the upgrading of religious education for religious and lay teachers as necessary for the proper functioning of Catholic schools. In addition, they were supportive of any proposals regarding Catholic text books and refresher courses for teachers of religion. Therefore, it can be concluded that, for the period 1921 to 1946, the trustees of the Edmonton Separate School District indirectly supported the theoretical position of the Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese regarding Catholic schooling.

Examination of the Minutes of the St. Albert School District, for this period, revealed that the school board members were more vocal concerning French language teaching than religious education.[76] There was no doubt about the fact that religious education took place in the St. Albert Catholic public schools. Classes in religion were conducted within the constraints imposed by the Department of Education. However, French language instruction,

employment of teachers capable of teaching French and the necessity of teaching the catechism in the language spoken by the child were issues often discussed at meetings of the trustees representing this district.

The Minutes of the Red Deer Roman Catholic Separate School District for the period 1921 to 1946 were not very enlightening as far as the Catholic theory of schooling was concerned. However, it was recorded on January 2, 1925 that "The School Board voted unanimously to write to Sr. Alfred to thank her for her efficient services during her stay in our school."[77] In addition, all four of the teachers hired for the 1936-37 school year were nuns. Therefore, it can be assumed that, despite the fact that religious education was not mentioned in the Minutes, the trustees expected that religious education and a religious atmosphere would exist once members of religious orders were employed as teachers. Lay Catholic teachers were apparently considered to be less religious than teachers from religious communities.

Like the Red Deer Minutes, those of the Wainwright Separate School District made no direct reference to the theoretical basis for Catholic schooling. However, on three occasions between 1941 and 1943 motions were moved and unanimously carried thanking the Reverend Sisters of St. Joseph for the good work they had done in the schools in the past school year.[78] Obviously the sisters were not only involved in teaching academic subjects but were also catering to the spiritual and moral needs of their pupils. In addition, priests often served as members of the Separate School

Board and, during the 1930's, Father H. Doyer served as chairman of the Wainwright Separate School Board for several years. Religious leaders were, therefore, involved in decision-making at the school district level which influenced the work of the school.

The Minutes of Roman Catholic Separate and Public School Districts examined for this period yielded little direct information regarding the Catholic philosophy of schooling. However, analysis of the few discussions regarding religious instruction and the role of teachers from religious orders has indicated that the trustees were satisfied that Catholic schooling would be efficiently carried out, both academically and spiritually, once teachers from religious orders were in the majority in the various schools. In other words, there was a division of labour with reference to the responsibilities of the trustees and those of the principal and staff. The school board had a role to play in ensuring that administrative matters were taken care of while the principal and staff were expected to cater to the academic and spiritual requirements of their pupils.

Conclusion

The materials studied in this chapter for the period 1921-1946 have revealed that the basic themes of Catholic schooling, enunciated by Pius IX and Leo XIII and reinforced by Pius XI in Divini Ilius Magistri, were fully endorsed by the religious hierarchy in Edmonton. The pastoral letters, speeches and other pronouncements by the archbishops and bishops provided evidence of this compliance

with Rome. The Western Catholic materials examined have added to the information concerning the position of the religious hierarchy in Edmonton. For example, editorials, reports of "Catholic Truth Broadcasts" and articles, speeches and other materials from local as well as international Catholic spokesmen all supported the basic themes of the prevailing Catholic theory of schooling.

Some of the writers attempted to relate the Catholic theory of schooling to the pressing world problems of the day. They suggested that godless education and materialism accompanied by progressive educational views that advocated freedom of the child from all authority were among the factors responsible for the chaotic state of the modern world. The Catholic critics of progressive education were traditionalist or essentialist in orientation. Further elaboration of the response to progressive education will be found in the next chapter.

Like their predecessors, the Catholic authorities cited in this chapter regarded religion and education as inseparable and maintained that Catholic schools provided the best example of this integration of moral and spiritual with academic and civic education. With reference to teachers, the general attitude appeared to be that religious personnel were more acceptable than lay teachers. This attitude could be clearly seen in discussions regarding teacher recruitment at school board meetings.

Examination of the Western Catholic newspaper revealed that the press played an important role in furthering the cause of Catholic schooling. Editorials, commentaries and other educational

publications were used to keep Catholic parents in the Archdiocese of Edmonton and the Diocese of Calgary informed that Catholic schools were available and that they should send their children to them. Further, the editorials often served as reminders of their obligation to do this and of their responsibility to support the efforts of the Catholic teachers in the schools.

The Minutes of school districts within the Archdiocese provided little direct information on the views of the trustees regarding the theory of Catholic schooling. However, some of the discussions revealed that the trustees were pleased with the work that teachers from religious congregations were doing in the schools. Implicit in this was the suggestion that lay teachers were not entirely satisfactory, particularly for the religious education component of the school day. The Minutes of the St. Albert public school board reflected a different concern from those of the other areas examined. French language teaching in the schools was a major issue in that district and this was a frequent topic at board meetings. It is interesting to note that the archbishops and bishops did not appear to be concerned over this issue. The trustees also supported efforts to get Catholic textbooks in the schools and approved of refresher courses in religious education for Catholic school teachers. It can be concluded that the trustees of the school districts examined did not discuss the Catholic theory of schooling because they were in agreement with the perspective of the religious hierarchy. They also preferred to leave the mechanics of providing religious education to the principal and

staff while they handled general policy issues.

French language teaching in St. Albert, teacher training and text book issues were old concerns that had existed since the days of Grandin and Legal. Similarly, the hierarchical orientation with key speakers such as popes and bishops being regarded as the ultimate authority was the same throughout the period of study. A new theme regarding the Catholic philosophy of life was mentioned -- that Catholics were non-materialistic and were not interested in immediate pleasure. Since only one spokesman made this claim, any discussion of the importance of this non-materialistic orientation to Catholic schooling would be purely speculative. However, what this theme suggested was that the ecclesiastical norms of the church took precedence over academic and materialistic norms. In other words, appropriate religiosity was more important than getting ahead in the world.

In the next chapter, Catholic materials in the Archdiocese will be reviewed to determine if the theory remained essentially the same in the period 1947-1960. The principal accomplishment of that period was the formation of the Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA), established in response to hierarchical perception of problems affecting Catholic schooling in Alberta. Consequently, the purpose, function and activities of the ACEA are important to the examination of the Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton after 1947.

Footnotes

[1]H.J. O'Leary, Pastoral Letter, December 26, 1920, Archdiocesan Archives, Edmonton.

[2]J.H. MacDonald, Pastoral Letter, March 24, 1939. Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Western Catholic, September 1, 1921.

[5]H.J. O'Leary, Pastoral Letter, February 2, 1923. Archives, op. cit.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Western Catholic, March 22, 1923.

[8]Ibid., April 12, 1923.

[9]Ibid., July 10, 1924.

[10]J.H. MacDonald, Pastoral Letter, November 21, 1940. Archives, op. cit.

[11]Western Catholic, October 15, 1925.

[12]J.H. MacDonald and F.P. Carroll, Joint Letter to the pastors of Edmonton and Calgary, August 10, 1942. Archives, op. cit.

[13]Western Catholic, February 11, 1931.

[14]Ibid., February 9, 1938.

[15]Ibid., June 14, 1939.

[16]Ibid., November 28, 1945.

[17]T. Cashman, Edmonton's Catholic Schools -- A Success Story. Edmonton: Jasper Printing Ltd., 1977. p. 137. According to Cashman, in 1929 there were 37 religious and 27 lay teachers in the Edmonton Separate School District and the aim for the next school year was a ratio of two religious to one lay teacher. This proportion was not only considered better from the point of view of religious education but for financial reasons. Religious teachers were paid less than lay teachers with the same qualifications because the lay teachers' salaries were decided by negotiation whereas the Archbishop could unilaterally decide on the salaries for religious teachers. Ibid.

[18]Western Catholic, February 11, 1931.

[19]Ibid., April 21, 1937.

[20]Ibid., April 10, 1940.

[21]Ibid., April 21, 1937.

[22]Ibid., April 17, 1940. Canon 1113 refers to parental obligation in education. It reads as follows: "Parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral as well as the physical and civil well-being of their children and for their temporal well-being."

Canon 1373 refers to the obligation of the Catholic school to provide religious education. It states that "In every elementary school, religious instruction adapted to the age of the children, must be given."

Canon 1374 governs attendance at mixed or neutral schools. It reads: "Catholic children must not attend neutral or mixed schools, and it is for the bishop of the place to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated without danger of perversion to the public." Ibid.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., April 24, 1940.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid., January 11, 1939.

[27]Ibid., February 8, 1939.

[28]Ibid., August 22, 1929.

[29]Ibid., February 6, 1930.

[30]Ibid., April 15, 1931.

[31]Ibid., February 22, 1933.

[32]Ibid. The relevant part of the quotation in the August 6, 1925 edition of the Western Catholic reads as follows: "There should be in this province both room for an urgent need of a Catholic Education Association . . . we should follow the lead of our brethren in the United States -- religious education must advance or we of today are being weighed in the balance and found wanting." There is no indication that action was taken to form an association in Alberta at this time.

[33]Ibid., January 28, 1926.

[34]Ibid., February 18, 1926.

[35]Ibid., July 1, 1936.

[36]Ibid., September 5, 1934. The editor referred to statements made by the Archbishop of Seattle regarding the principles of justice or moral education as evidence of the need to teach catechism. In addition, he quoted from the Archbishop of Edmonton's address at a confirmation ceremony in which he urged Catholic parents to ensure that the schools had Catholic teachers and that teachers taught Catechism. These references were intended as reinforcements for his arguments in favour of Catholic schools in which the tenets of Catholic religion were taught.

[37]Ibid., September 2, 1936.

[38]Ibid., October 6, 1943, September 4, 1943, August 7, 1946.

[39]Ibid., February 18, 1931.

[40]Ibid., August 15, 1934.

[41]Ibid., July 5, 1933.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid., July 25, 1934.

[44]Ibid., November 18, 1931.

[45]Ibid., February 11, 1926.

[46]Ibid., August 29, 1934. According to Benedict Elder, Pope Pius XI had emphasized the priority of parents over the state with regard to education in his reply to Mussolini's statement to the Italian Chamber that the state had the right to dictate the education of the nation's youth.

[47]Ibid., July 21, 1937. Dr. McGrath was referring to Canon 1113 (Footnote 22) that outlined parental obligation in education.

[48]Ibid., September 24, 1941.

[49]Ibid., October 13, 1943.

[50]Ibid., June 21, 1944.

[51]Ibid., August 30, 1944.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid., February 25, 1931.

[54]Ibid., August 29, 1934. According to the writer "Where instruction in religion is omitted from education, that education is a travesty of what it should be." This was in keeping with the views expressed by the Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton.

[55]Ibid., May 16, 1934.

[56]Ibid., September 18, 1935.

[57]Ibid., January 22, 1936.

[58]Ibid., June 21, 1944.

[59]Ibid., June 9, 1943.

[60]Ibid., September 10, 1941.

[61]Ibid., May 12, 1943.

[62]Ibid., June 9, 1943.

[63]Ibid., December 28, 1932.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid., January 11, 1933.

[66]Ibid., August 21, 1935.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Cashman, op. cit., p. 146.

[70]Minutes, Edmonton Separate School Board, July 19, 1929.

[71]Ibid., August 21, 1931.

[72]Ibid., April 13, 1937.

[73]Ibid., April 8, 1940.

[74]Ibid., November 18, 1940.

[75]Ibid., May 15, 1944.

[76]Minutes, St. Albert Public School District, January 5, 1920 to June 25, 1941. No minutes could be located for the period 1941 to 1957. In 1941, discussion between the Sturgeon School Division and the St. Albert School District regarding consolidation began. This consolidation took place and it was not until 1957 that the St. Albert Public School District became an independent district again. The Minutes for 1941 to 1957 are probably included in those of the Sturgeon School Division. However, the writer was unable to get information regarding this from the St. Albert School Board or the Sturgeon School Division.

[77]Minutes, Red Deer Roman Catholic Separate School District, January 2, 1925.

[78]Minutes, Wainwright Catholic Separate School Board, January 30, 1941, January 29, 1942, February 25, 1943.

Chapter V

Reassessment and Reorganization; Traditionalism versus Progressivism -- The Theory of Catholic Schooling, 1947-1960

Introduction

The theory of Catholic schooling enunciated by papal authorities was supported by the religious hierarchy in the Archdiocese of Edmonton. As has been shown in previous chapters, this theory began to evolve in the area now known as Alberta from 1884 when the first school ordinance of the North-West Territories was passed. Up to 1947, the theory that was endorsed by the Oblates between 1884 and 1905, the years of official territorial schooling, had remained unchanged. Subsequent leaders of the church have reemphasized and reinforced this theory. While continuing to give uncritical support to Vatican statements regarding schooling, Catholic leaders in Edmonton built on the educational foundations laid by the Catholic missionary pioneers in the region.

The religious and lay Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton during this period not only reiterated the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling, but also recognized, discussed and attempted to find solutions to problems that were affecting the practical application of the theory. Among the issues discussed were financial problems facing Catholic schools, difficulties surrounding the recruitment of religious personnel for teaching,

the priesthood and other vocations, parental neglect of their responsibility to send their children to Catholic schools and the need for social justice. In addition, several Catholic spokesmen were extremely critical of progressive educational theory.

In this chapter materials that further illustrate and support the theory of Catholic schooling for the period 1947-1960 will be examined. In addition, articles, speeches and other documents that indicate the educational problems identified by Catholic leaders and the measures they used to overcome those problems will be discussed. The year 1960 has been chosen as the point at which to end this study, because it is the year following the official publication of the findings of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. In that year the Catholic hierarchy in Alberta responded to the findings of the Majority and Minority Reports of the commissioners. It is anticipated that their response to these Reports will provide further insights into their views regarding the Catholic theory of schooling and problems facing Catholic schooling in the province.

Materials that will be examined in this chapter include pastoral letters and speeches by bishops and archbishops of Alberta, Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) Bulletins and other publications, Western Catholic materials and Minutes of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association (ACSTA) 1958-1960 and of the Edmonton, Red Deer, Wainwright and Vegreville separate and the St. Albert public school districts, 1947-1960.

It is anticipated that an examination of the above materials will provide evidence of reinforcement of the theory of schooling

developed in previous chapters. In addition, further analysis will reveal that, besides reiterating the basic themes of the theory advocated by the papal authorities and supported by American Catholic spokesmen, the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese and the rest of Alberta were discussing and attempting to find solutions to current local problems facing Catholic schooling.

Pastoral Letters and Speeches by Bishops and Archbishops

Few pastoral letters pertaining to schooling could be found for this period. The most significant of the ones located was the letter that commented on the Reports of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta which were released in 1959. In other letters references were made to the financial problems facing Catholic schools in Alberta and the necessity of maintaining these schools in spite of those problems.

In a letter to the clergy, religious and faithful laity in the Archdiocese of Edmonton on May 21, 1947, Archbishop MacDonald stressed the need for all Catholics to work towards "strengthening and expanding certain of the Church's ministrations to its people, particularly in the fields of Catholic Education, Youth Work and Charity."[1] MacDonald reiterated the necessity of maintaining Catholic schools and noted that, because separate schools were receiving "practically no share of corporation taxes" and the costs of building, equipping and operating schools were rising, the separate schools were in dire need of financial assistance. He added that "above everything else, our schools must be maintained,

no matter what the cost, and they must compare favourably in construction and facilities with other schools in the Province."[2] In this letter, the Archbishop was reviewing the practical problems facing Catholic leaders in maintaining and improving Catholic schools while soliciting financial support from the laity. He realized that the Catholic separate school system had to compare favourably with the public school system if it expected to retain the existing clientele as well as recruit new clients. MacDonald felt that these issues had to be resolved for the theory of Catholic schooling to be successfully implemented.

The full text of an address delivered by Archbishop MacDonald at the opening of the Catholic Women's League Convention in Ottawa was printed in the December 10, 1951 edition of the ACEA Bulletin. MacDonald was the keynote speaker at the opening luncheon and his topic was "The Catholic School." He reminded his listeners that the primary educational right in the natural order belongs to the parents, while the prior right in the supernatural order belongs to the church. He referred to statements by Leo XIII and Pius XI which emphasized that religious instruction in Catholic schools was not sufficient but that the entire school day should be regulated by the Christian spirit. MacDonald then proceeded to define the Catholic school:

> The Catholic school might therefore be defined as one in which teachers with deep faith, with ardent love of God and the Church which he founded strive in every exercise of their teaching office, to guide their pupils to learn and to live in the light of truth which God has revealed; where religion holds not only the first place on the curriculum, but animates all the studies and activities of students and teachers alike.[3]

Archbishop MacDonald acknowledged that all the statements made by the popes and supported by him described the ideal Catholic school. Catholic schools in Alberta were not ideal, but they were a compromise between the Catholic ideal and the public schools:

> Catholic schools in the Province of Alberta are a sort of compromise between the genuine Catholic school with its textbooks, Christian atmosphere and devoted staff on one hand, and the public school with its ban on religious teaching because of the multifarious beliefs of those in attendance. Ours are not ideal schools, but they are vastly superior to those from which religion is excluded altogether.[4]

MacDonald admitted that Catholic schools in Alberta often failed to produce enlightened, cooperative Christian citizens but added that the public schools were also failing in that respect. Further, he emphasized that, contrary to the general public view, teachers were not entirely to blame for the failure to produce representative Christian citizens; in fact, parents were more blameworthy than teachers. Parents were the teachers for the first five or six years of life -- impressionable years when the foundation of future conduct had to be laid. Therefore, he concluded that Catholic schools could not move forward towards the ideal until parents fulfilled their obligations regarding spiritual preparation of their children in the formative years and cooperation with the school and teachers during the school attendance years.

It is apparent that Archbishop MacDonald recognized the shortcomings of Catholic schools in the Province and accepted that they were far from the ideal. However, he was expressing an unsubstantiated opinion when he stated that Catholic schools were vastly superior to schools from which religion was excluded.

He neglected to explain in what ways they were superior and what criteria he had used to come to such a conclusion.

The province of Alberta celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1955. In August of that year, Archbishop MacDonald wrote to his adherents reminding them that the church had come to Alberta long before the province came into existence; in fact, by 1905, the church had been well established in the main centres of the province. He noted that the church had grown considerably throughout the province in the fifty years since the attainment of provincial status:

> In 1905, one diocese and one bishop served the whole vast area. Today there is a well-organized hierarchy with an archdiocese at Edmonton and suffragan sees at Calgary, St. Paul and Grouard, and Catholics of the Byzantine rite have their own bishop and diocesan organization.[5]

With reference to schooling, MacDonald stated that Catholic schools were an "integral and worthy part of the provincial system."[6] He then outlined the role of religion in education and the Catholic position on that issue:

> Catholics certainly feel that the subject of religion from its very nature, should have its proper place on every school curriculum. It deals with God and His perfections, and is therefore, the most sublime subject that could be imagined. The claim that it can be taught sufficiently in the home and the Sunday school is preposterous.[7]

MacDonald's views regarding religious education in school were supportive of the Catholic theory of schooling that had been enunciated by other clerics in Alberta as well as leaders in other parts of the Catholic world. It should be noted that MacDonald dismissed the claim that religion should only be taught at home and

at Sunday school as preposterous, but did not give his reasons for arriving at that conclusion. That type of remark was typical of the Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese who expected Catholics to accept their position unquestioningly.

In a letter to the clergy on March 2, 1956, Archbishop MacDonald called their attention to the vocation exhibit that had been prepared by the Fathers of St. Alphonsus parish and which would be open to the public shortly. He emphasized that there was a shortage of vocations in Canada and that this was especially true of the Western Dioceses. MacDonald reminded the clergy of the importance of vocations to education as well as to the propagation of the faith. Although the greater part of his letter dealt with the need for priests, he added that all of his remarks applied equally to the various sisterhoods:

> Short as we are of candidates for the priesthood, it may be safely said that our sisterhoods are still shorter, and yet on them depends the operation of most of our schools, and all our charitable organizations.[8]

Because of the need for more vocations to the priesthood and the religious life, the archbishop exhorted the clergy to give every encouragement and publicity to the exhibition. He concluded his message with the following request regarding the exhibition:

> Teachers and pupils are hereby requested to pray for its success, that it may bring an increase of vocations from the families of every parish so that we may have the happiness of seeing a speedier fulfillment of the Saviour's mission to His apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature.[9]

MacDonald clearly differentiated between the roles of priests and

nuns in spreading Catholicism. Priests were required to preach the gospel while nuns were needed to teach in the schools and do charitable work. Therefore, recruitment for vocations was required in both areas so that the work of the schools and the parishes could proceed smoothly. MacDonald was obviously supportive of the Catholic belief that religious personnel were better prepared for the task of teaching and were capable of ensuring that a religious atmosphere permeated the entire school day.

In a pastoral letter written to coincide with Social Action Sunday (May 13, 1956), MacDonald reminded Catholics of the need for social justice which had been clearly defined by Leo XIII in his encyclical Rerum Novarum (1891). MacDonald stressed the role of education in promoting social action:

> Education is the power underlying every social movement. Through it we get a clear picture of the work to be done, and the principles to be applied in solving the difficulties that stand in the way.[10]

The Archbishop quoted from figures released by the Federal Government, listing items on which Canadians spent most in 1954, which illustrated that Canadians spent over sixteen dollars more per capita on alcoholic drinks than they spent on education.[11] As far as he was concerned, those figures showed that there was tremendous need for social education to make Canadians aware of what their priorities should be. MacDonald was suggesting that schooling or other educational outlets could influence social action directly. In addition, the age-old problem of inadequate funding for schools still existed. Therefore, MacDonald was using the per capita alcoholic and educational spending statistics to remind Catholics in the Edmonton

Archdiocese of the inadequacy of the funds that were being allocated to schooling. Obviously, the underlying implication behind this comparison was that the theory of Catholic schooling could not be adequately applied through the school system without improved financing.

On December 31, 1957 the lieutenant-governor of Alberta established a Royal Commission to enquire into the state of education in the province. Senator D. Cameron headed a team of six commissioners who were appointed to undertake that task. After nearly two years of receiving briefs, listening to petitions and analysing the information received, the commissioners presented their findings to the lieutenant-governor on November 9, 1959. There was disagreement between the Catholic commissioner and the other five members over the content of the report. As a result, the lieutenant-governor was presented with a Majority Report signed by five commissioners and a Minority Report signed by Mr. J. Cormack, the Catholic commissioner.

The only pastoral letter, located for this period, that dealt specifically with Catholic educational theory and the problems encountered by Catholic educators in a predominantly secular provincial educational system, was the letter released by the Archbishop and Bishops of Alberta on March 6, 1960 in response to the Reports of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. This joint pastoral letter was signed by Archbishops MacDonald and Jordan of Edmonton, Bishops Carroll of Calgary, Savarayn of the Ukrainian diocese of Edmonton, Lussier of St. Paul and Reverends Routhier and Piché, Vicar Apostolics of Grouard and Mackenzie respectively.

Therefore, it was a document that had the approval of all the Catholic religious leaders in Alberta.

In the letter the Catholic leaders reminded clerical and lay Catholics in Alberta that a Royal Commission had been established on December 31, 1957 to enquire into the state of education in Alberta. The work of the commission took two years during which many briefs were presented to it, including one from the Bishops of Alberta. The main points of the Bishops' brief were that the Educational Council, which had been established by the School Ordinance of 1891, be re-established; centralization of education should not be forced on Catholics; separate schools should be given priority of treatment with public schools in matters of finance; and Catholic parents should be permitted to realize their philosophy of education through a curriculum and texts designed to achieve the aims of Catholic education and through the establishment of a system of Catholic teacher training. While the Catholic leaders found much to commend in both reports, they contended that the Majority Report was clearly biased against Catholic views:

> We have read these reports with the greatest interest and find much to commend in both. However, we regret the complete omission in the Majority Report, of any evidence that a single recommendation submitted by the Catholics received favourable consideration by its signers. Indeed the statements of the Majority (when dealing specifically with the Separate School system) reveal an attitude, which clearly manifests an unmistakable bias against all of our reasonable aspirations. Only in the Minority Report are the views presented in the Briefs submitted by the Catholics, given an understanding consideration and we are grateful to Mr. Cormack for upholding our principles.[12]

The Catholic hierarchy then proceeded to summarize the principles of Catholic education.[13] According to them, these principles were held by all Catholics, clerical and lay. The archbishops and bishops refuted statements made in the Majority Report indicating that there was dissension and lack of conviction among Catholics:

> There is not and cannot be dissension or lack of common conviction among us, as the Majority Report gratuitously claims, because the basic principles of Catholic Education are an integral part of our Faith; and it is only on these principles that systems of modern education can be evaluated.[14]

The Catholic hierarchy maintained that there was neither dissension nor lack of conviction among Catholics but did not produce any evidence to support that point of view. Apparently the spiritual heads of the Catholic church in Alberta were unwilling to admit that it was possible that some Catholics were not committed to the official Catholic position regarding schooling.

The bishops referred to the Alberta Act of 1905, which had given legal sanction to the educational rights enjoyed by religious minorities in Alberta prior to 1905, to emphasize that Catholic principles in education had a legal basis in the school law of the province.[15] They suggested that there was no conflict between the church and the province regarding education. There had been tremendous population growth in the province between 1905 and 1960; the Catholic population had also grown for Catholics numbered about one-quarter of the provincial population by 1960. That growth had created additional financial burdens for Catholic schools and the spiritual leaders regretted that the government had not seen fit to give Catholics separate schools funding that was on par with that of

the public schools.

From their comments it can be concluded that the archbishops and bishops of Alberta favoured the Minority Report and opposed the conclusions of the authors of the Majority Report regarding Catholic schooling. Moreover, they were extremely critical of the majority commissioners and accused them of ignoring the issues raised in submissions by Catholic groups. This letter is a good example of the role of the Catholic hierarchy in defining, supporting and propagating the Catholic theory of schooling in Alberta.

The statements regarding education made by the archbishops and bishops in pastoral letters and by MacDonald at the Catholic Women's League Convention in Ottawa (1951) were similar to their comments on this topic in several speeches delivered at Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) conventions. Preparations for the formation of the ACEA began in 1946 and the association was registered the following year. On April 10, 1947, the first annual convention of the ACEA was held in Edmonton. Bishop Carroll of the Diocese of Calgary was the principal convention speaker.

In an address entitled "Christian Education" Carroll stated that "Catholic education is Christian education, that is, education according to the spirit and principles of Jesus Christ."[16] He referred to Pius XI's encyclical of 1929 which emphasized the supreme importance of Christian education as an effort to stem the tide of materialism. Carroll congratulated the founders of the ACEA on the formation of that association which had the same purpose as Pius XI's encyclical:

> It is therefore a joy and an encouragement to witness the foundation of your association, which has the same purpose of arousing interest in Christian education and promoting its cause as an all important means of saving our civilization from shipwreck.[17]

Carroll described modern or neutral education as an inadequate preparation for life which could result in delinquency, immorality and other related problems. He suggested that the purpose of the ACEA was to ensure that Christian education for Catholics was preserved and maintained. He added that Catholics in Alberta were fortunate to have schools that used the same curriculum and materials as the public schools but were permitted to pursue the principles of Christian education:

> We are most fortunate in this province of Alberta, where our Catholic schools are part of the Public School system, where the courses of study, methods standards, teacher requirements and so forth are the same in both public and separate schools but in which we can follow the principles of Christian education.[18]

Bishop Carroll then proceeded to define the Catholic concept of Christian education:

> Just what do we Catholics mean by education? We hold that it is not the mere imparting of knowledge, the mere filling up of the empty spaces of the mind, the mere development of neutral faculties. Nor is it the mere cultivation of the physical powers of man. The limitation of education to man's physical and intellectual faculties is the major defect of modern education . . . Christian education respects the whole man -- his will as well as his mind, his soul as well as his body, -- because it realizes that his moral and religious faculties must be developed along with his physical and intellectual.[19]

Carroll's remarks regarding the need for spiritual as well as temporal education were in keeping with the official policy of the church

regarding education. Leo XIII, Pius XI, the American Catholic educational hierarchy, Catholic leaders from other Canadian provinces as well as the archbishops and clerical educators in the Archdiocese of Edmonton had made similar statements on many occasions. All of these Catholic spokesmen suggested that only Catholic schools catered to man's moral and spiritual development.

In another address at the same convention entitled "The Apostolate of the Alberta Catholic Education Association" Carroll further clarified the Catholic concept of education and the function of the ACEA. He emphasized that Catholic schools differed from public schools because Catholic schools concerned themselves with the development of Christian character:

> Hence the chief and only reason for the existence of Catholic schools is to provide a Christian education. They have no other purpose, -- and that one purpose is a supremely important one for the temporal as well as the spiritual salvation of the world and the only solution of its ills. And this purpose is the consequence of a duty to which every Catholic is in conscience bound, namely, to see to it that every Catholic receives not merely what is called an education, but a Christian education whether the State provides for it or not.20

According to Carroll, Christian education was necessary for all Catholic children. It was so important that Catholics were obligated to provide this type of schooling for their children even if there was no state support. In a province like Alberta, where there was support of Catholic schools, the onus was on Catholics to ensure that their children attended these schools and took advantage of the moral/religious education being offered in these institutions. Carroll added that the purpose of the ACEA was to support the stand

of the church regarding education and reawaken and maintain the interest of Catholics in Catholic schooling. Carroll's remarks implied that the interest of Catholic parents in Catholic schooling was declining. Therefore, one of the tasks of the ACEA was to reawaken parental interest in Catholic schooling for their offspring.

Carroll outlined some of the problems that the ACEA would have to face in its efforts to arouse and maintain interest in Catholic education. Many Catholics had fallen away from the teachings of the church and were leading lives that were not in keeping with Christian principles. Most Catholic teachers were not trained in Catholic educational principles; they had been educated in neutral normal schools and were confusing Catholic education with the naturalistic philosophy of education. Other teachers were operating on the premise that Christian education consisted of teaching the catechism only. Carroll re-emphasized the position of the Catholic church regarding the role of religion in education:

> Religion enters every subject in the curriculum, the environment of the school, the discipline and all the rest. The Christian teacher thinks a great deal of forming Christian habits and Christian ideals in the pupils.[21]

From the sentiments expressed in these two addresses it is apparent that Bishop Carroll recognized that Catholic schools were failing in their attempts to put the Catholic theory of schooling into practice. He appeared to have analysed the causes of this inability to translate the theory into practice and had discovered some of the inherent problems. He regarded the ACEA as necessary because the Catholic hierarchy could work through that association to re-awaken interest

in the Catholic theory of schooling by providing workshops and study groups for both lay and religious teachers and by involving Catholic parents in study groups and other activities that would provide information on the Catholic theory of schooling. Carroll identified the following problems: -- Catholic schools were not doing the job they were intended to do; many parents were failing in their duties regarding Christian education of their offspring; and the religious instruction offered in many of Alberta's Catholic schools was unsuitable or poorly administered because of inadequate teacher preparation.

In 1948, the principal address at the ACEA convention was delivered by H. Routhier, Bishop of Grouard. The theme of Routhier's address was "Christian Education." Routhier reminded his listeners that Jesus had rebuked those who sought to send the little ones who had gathered around him away with the words, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God." He added that those words provided the example that had guided the educational policy of the church throughout the centuries for, immediately after a church had been established a school had been set up wherever that was possible. Routhier informed his audience that he relied heavily on Pius XI's Christian Education of Youth (1929) in preparing his address. He reiterated the Catholic theory of schooling, reaffirming the divine mission of the church, the inalienable educational rights of parents and the civil authority of the state.[22] He then proceeded to outline some of the dangers to Christian education in modern society, such as

child-centred naturalistic education, indelicate initiation in the matter of purity of morals and coeducation. In addition, because many parents were neglecting their role in the moral formation of their children, a greater burden was being placed on the school. Therefore, Routhier concluded that the job of the ACEA was to make Catholics aware of these problems so that they could take remedial action themselves and try to win over non-Catholics who were also disillusioned with modern education:

> Surely it is time that we open our eyes to the gravity of the situation and by forming study clubs on religious and educational problems, we awaken all our Catholics and create in them a truly apostolic spirit not only to diminish the leakage but also to win over to our point of view of Christian education many of our non-Catholic friends who, as well as we, realize the dangers to their children from education in an ungodly atmosphere.[23]

Routhier's remarks were similar to those made by Carroll the previous year. It is apparent, therefore, that the Catholic hierarchy recognized that there were major discrepancies between the theory and practice of Catholic schooling. They had identified some of the problems that they felt were responsible for these discrepancies and had created an association (ACEA) to work towards eliminating the discrepancies and forging a closer link between the theory and practice of Catholic schooling.

The annual convention of the ACEA continued as a forum for the reaffirmation of Catholic educational principles by the Catholic hierarchy throughout the period under study. At some of the conventions the principal speaker was a bishop from a sister province while at others, one of the Alberta bishops officiated. Nevertheless,

regardless of the location from which the speaker came, the message remained essentially the same. For example, when Bishop J.M. Hill of Victoria addressed the convention in 1950, the title of his speech was "Our Youth and Christian Living." Bishop Hill reminded his listeners that parents not only had the primary right in education, but that they had the obligation to ensure that their children were given religious training.[24] He added that wherever Catholic schools were available the duty of Catholic parents was to support them and enrol their children in them. Like Carroll and Routhier, Hill regarded Catholic education as a preparation for complete living. That type of educational experience would develop the physical, moral and intellectual capacities of the individual in preparation for his work in this world and for his eternal destiny. Hill praised Pius XI for providing Catholic educators throughout the world with the tools for the task of attaining the goal of Christian education through his "masterful analysis and exposition of the principles underlying Christian education."[25] In addition, Hill affirmed that, since man was a spiritual being with duties towards his creator, education must accord a primary place to knowledge of God's laws and must cultivate obedience to his commandments.[26] Once these prerequisites were taken care of, the educated Christian would successfully fulfill all civic and social duties as well. Like his fellow bishops who had addressed earlier conventions, Hill regarded Christian education as a panacea for the ills of the day. As far as they were concerned, the social problems of the day were rooted in godless education, neglect of Christian values by lapsed Catholics and other groups in

society and the failure of parents to fulfill their moral educational duties to their offspring. These were the facts of the situation that the ACEA was faced with; the primary function of that association was to come to grips with these issues and provide solutions so that the Catholic theory of schooling could be effectively applied, reinforced and diffused.

A similar viewpoint was presented by the Most Reverend P.F. Pocock, Bishop of Saskatoon, at the 1951 convention of the ACEA. In his address entitled "Why a Catholic School?" Pocock noted that when Pius XI declared that all the teaching and the entire organization of the school, teachers, syllabus and textbooks should be regulated by the Christian spirit, he was merely repeating the dictum which had been laid down by Leo XIII previously.[27] Pocock's statement was significant because most of the other bishops, who described Divini Ilius Magistri as the foundation of the Catholic theory of schooling, did not acknowledge Leo XIII's contribution to that theory. Obviously, Pocock was using this reference, not only to acknowledge Leo XIII's contributions to Catholic educational theory, but also to remind his listeners that the current Catholic theory of schooling had been formulated in the nineteenth century by an influential papal figure.

Bishop Pocock also outlined the main aspects of Christian schooling:

> Specifically the child must be taught:
> 1) That God exists and what God is like;
> 2) Man's nature, particularly the spirituality and immortality of the soul;
> 3) Man's origin and the purpose of man's life;

4) The nature of the supernatural life to which man has been elevated;
5) How the spiritual life was lost to man and recovered by Incarnation and Redemption of Christ, the Son of God;
6) God's plan of redemption through membership in his Church;
7) What is right and what is wrong and why;
8) How to pray and how to live.[28]

Pocock added that it was not sufficient that these truths be taught as a subject; rather, he emphasized that these truths must be lived and must influence every subject, every activity and every department of the school. In other words, religion must permeate that entire school day and the entire school. He recognized that this was not happening in Catholic schools but maintained that this was what should be. Since this atmosphere was necessary for Catholic education, the end and aim of the ACEA should be to work always for that ideal of Catholic education.

Bishop Pocock was obviously re-emphasizing the permeation theory of Catholic schooling and reminding his listeners that this theory was not being successfully implemented in Catholic schools. Throughout these convention addresses by the various bishops the point was repeatedly made that there were inadequacies in Catholic schools. What was needed was a return to the basic tenets of Catholic schooling theory. The role of the ACEA and all other Catholic educational associations was to work towards the achievement of that goal.

The views expressed by Bishops Carroll, Routhier, Hill and Pocock were further reinforced by Carroll in a subsequent address to the ninth annual ACEA convention in 1955.[29] Carroll reiterated the

views regarding education that he had expressed earlier and noted that there were many products of Catholic education who were failing to practice Christ's principles and who were a disgrace to the name of Christian. He re-emphasized the primary role of parents, the necessity of beginning Christian education at birth, and the permeation principle for religious education. Carroll reiterated his position that Catholic teachers were inadequately prepared for teaching Christian truths because of the unavailability of Catholic teacher training facilities. Further, he suggested that some Catholic schools in Alberta were failing to provide a Christian education:

> A final cause of defection in our efforts to provide a Christian education may be found in the school itself. Too many of us regard our Catholic schools merely as the equivalent of neutral public schools with the extra subject of catechism on the curriculum . . . It is true that the intellectual and physical development are the same in both Catholic and public schools, and our schools must answer the standards required in these by the state authorities. But if a Catholic school does not go far beyond these, and develop Christian morality and Christian living as well, the school is not answering the reason for its existence.[30]

Carroll emphasized that Catholic schools which were just replicas of neutral public schools with a half-an-hour of religious instruction at the end of the day were failing in their primary function as Christian educational institutions.

In conclusion, Bishop Carroll once more reminded the ACEA of its purpose -- to promote Christian education. He added that he had approached his topic from a negative point of view and had stressed the defects and failures rather than the accomplishments of Catholic schooling. He explained that he was not suggesting that there had not been accomplishments; rather, he was pointing out the defects

and failures so that the leaders and supporters of the ACEA would become aware of them and work quickly to overcome them. It is apparent that Carroll was concerned about the general lack of interest in religion and felt that the school was the place where measures could be taken to raise the religious consciousness of future generations of Catholic Albertans.

At the 1957 ACEA convention, the principal address was delivered by T.J. McCarthy, Bishop of Nelson, British Columbia. Bishop McCarthy's theme was "Education and Sanity." While endorsing the views regarding Catholic education postulated by his fellow bishops at previous conventions of the ACEA, McCarthy added a further dimension to statements made in the past regarding progressive education. He launched a direct attack on Dewey and his supporters describing them as pragmatists who had introduced a dangerous theory of education that had been put into practice unquestioningly. This theory of education was based on the erroneous premise that "things are to be understood through their origins and functions, without the intrusion of supernatural considerations."[31] McCarthy contended that pragmatism was inadequate as a concept of life and education and the Catholic philosophy of education stood with firm and positive direction against it. Pragmatism was a theory that limited man's preparation for life to his brief span of existence in this world. According to McCarthy any system of education that neglected the hereafter was incomplete, misleading and diametrically opposed to God's plan for human life.[32]

McCarthy reminded his listeners that their responsibilities did not end with the erecting, equipping and staffing of Catholic schools but that they also had to guard against the dangers of propaganda and pragmatism:

> It is not enough to see that Catholic schools are erected, equipped and staffed. We must at all times be on guard against insidious propaganda, whether in the textbooks prescribed for common use in our schools, the directives of governing bodies, or the pedagogical approach to a subject. Pragmatism in the field of education is as dangerous as Communism in the field of statescraft, for both are based on a denial of the supernatural order and both seek to substitute for the Kingdom of God upon earth, in which alone man can find his true place, the Kingdom of Man in Excelsis, which rests on false philosophy and the whims of human passion, and can only lead to confusion and disillusionment.[33]

The final section of McCarthy's address dealt with the issue of Christian social teaching. He stated that the popes had repeatedly pointed out to Catholics that a keen sense of social responsibility was needed in this age. In a letter to the Fourth Annual Session of the Catholic Social Life Conference held in Toronto, Monsignor Dell'Acqua, Substitute Papal Secretary of State, had stated that Catholic social teaching should be an integral part of the education of Christian youth.[34] Therefore, McCarthy concluded that, because of the difficult problems existing in the economic and social world, the mission of Christian education was to ensure that sanity prevailed.

Bishop McCarthy differed somewhat from his colleagues in his approach to the issues surrounding Christian education. Rather than make indirect references to neutral schools and progressive education, he openly attacked the pragmatist point of view espoused by Dewey and his supporters. In addition, he stressed the importance of guarding

against anti-Catholic propaganda in textbooks and pedagogy and the need for Christian Social Teaching in the schools. His comments were useful in clarifying some of the issues that were crucial to the hierarchy in Alberta in the 1950's.

In an address entitled "Speaking on Behalf of Children," delivered at the ACEA Convention in 1958, A. Jordan, Coadjutor Archbishop of Edmonton, did not present any original views; in fact, he repeated some of the basic tenets of the Catholic theory of schooling that had been enunciated and reinforced by the hierarchy throughout this study.[35] Like his predecessors, Jordan was critical of parents who neglected their duty as the first educators of their children and expected the school to do their job for them.

The leaders of the Catholic church, whose letters and addresses were discussed in this section, were all agreed on what the Catholic theory of schooling was and the need for improvement in the practical application of this theory. Several of them stated that Catholic schooling was beset by many problems such as inadequate religious instruction of children in the home, lack of facilities for the training of Catholic teachers, Catholics who did not ensure that their children attended Catholic schools and Catholics who failed to practice Christian social responsibility. These leaders used the opportunity of addressing the ACEA convention as a forum for pointing out the defects of Catholic schooling, attacking progressive education and pragmatism and reminding members that the purpose of the ACEA was to introduce measures to ensure that the practical aspects of Catholic schooling were carried out more efficiently.

Further, the ACEA would also ensure that the basic tenets of Catholicism were maintained in the schools.

It can be observed that, although the theory remained the same, the leaders recognized and openly admitted that in practice Catholic schooling was not fully achieving the aims outlined in the theory. According to the leaders, the ACEA had been formed because the hierarchy in Alberta had recognized that many Catholic schools were not approaching the theoretical ideal. The purpose of the ACEA was to work towards the application of the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling in the classrooms of Alberta.

In the next section the Bulletins and any other related publications of the ACEA will be examined to determine what the membership felt the purpose of the association was. In addition, the measures advocated by the leaders of the Catholic church in Edmonton to ensure that the aims of Catholic schooling were realized will be discussed. This examination will also determine how successful the ACEA was in its efforts to reawaken the interest of apathetic Catholics in Catholic schooling.

ACEA Bulletins/Publications

The Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) was incorporated under the Societies Act of the province of Alberta in March 1947. Less than a month later the first annual convention of the association was held in Edmonton. According to the association's Bulletin of September 25, 1947:

> Leaders of Catholic thought, both clerical and lay, over a period of a year, made a careful study of Alberta Catholic education problems, and found that, if those problems were to be adequately met, Catholics everywhere in the province would have to organise for study work and united action.[36]

As a result of those deliberations, the ACEA was officially launched at the Convention in April 1947 with the full sanction and blessing of the Catholic hierarchy of the province. The objectives of the association, outlined in the preamble to the Constitution, were:

> (1) To promote all phases of Christian education;
> (2) To study educational problems in the light of Christian philosophy;
> (3) To strive towards the spiritual improvement of its members;
> (4) To promote understanding among educators, parents and students;
> (5) To establish and maintain libraries and to publish or cause to be published under the supervision and control of the Association any publications, pamphlets or periodicals as shall be in keeping with and not inconsistent with number (1) herein;
> (6) To direct, manage, supervise and control, the business, property and funds of the Association.[37]

According to a statement by the ACEA executive, studies had been conducted which indicated that one of the major problems that the association had to overcome was the apathy of many Catholics who were willing to give up Catholic educational principles in exchange for new, larger and improved school buildings and modern educational methods that ignored God and religion. They emphasized that, if the ACEA was to be successful, it needed the support of all Catholics in the province. The executive insisted that, the ACEA was not an organization for parents and teachers alone -- membership was open to all who were interested in the future of Catholic education. Therefore, in each issue of the quarterly Bulletin,

Catholics were exhorted to join the association and assist in promoting the cause of Catholic education.

From the resolutions passed at the annual convention in 1948, it is apparent that the ACEA had identified two major problems affecting Catholic schooling in Alberta -- the need for financial assistance to set up more Catholic schools and the shortage of Catholic teachers.[38] With regard to the financial problem, the ACEA urged Catholics to set up and maintain their own schools wherever that was financially possible and urged the government to give consideration to the financial and other handicaps under which Alberta Catholic schools were operating. The resolution regarding shortage of teachers asked pastors to bring to the attention of their people the urgent need of Catholic teachers stressing the importance to the church of proper religious education of youth.

The executive officers of the ACEA were staunch supporters of the educational principles laid down by Pius XI in his 1929 encyclical. This was evident from the Bulletin issued on December 20, 1948 dedicated to the memory of Pius XI:

> This number of our ACEA "Bulletin" is humbly dedicated to the glorious and holy memory of the late Pope Pius XI whose encyclical letter "The Christian Education of Youth" sets forth in trenchant and clear style for Catholics their right and duties in the all-important matter of the education of their children. Many of our Catholic people have never read this encyclical and are therefore for the most part ignorant of its important content. The following excerpts from the encyclical should be read and carefully studied by all ACEA members. If we are to continue to be enthusiastic promoters of the aims and objects of our Association, we must be convinced ourselves of the importance of a Catholic education and of Catholic schools.[39]

The excerpts selected from Divini Ilius Magistri dealt with a number of issues including the rights of the church, parents and the state in education and the unsuitability of neutral and mixed schools for Catholic children. This Bulletin reiterated the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling for the information and guidance of ACEA members who were unfamiliar with or had forgotten the basic principles of Catholic schooling outlined by the Vatican. The review of Divini Ilius Magistri was one of the major measures used by the ACEA to reawaken interest in Catholic schooling.

On March 6, 1949, Reverend A.J. MacDonald of Victoria, British Columbia, addressed graduands at pre-graduation exercises held at St. Joseph's College in Edmonton. The full text of MacDonald's address "Education and Democracy" -- was printed in the Bulletin of April 2, 1949. MacDonald informed his listeners that there were four fundamental or basic philosophies of education -- idealism, materialism or naturalism, humanism and supernaturalism. He explained that supernaturalism and Christian education were one and the same because the tenets of supernaturalism and the teachings of Christianity were inseparable.[40] For MacDonald and the Catholic hierarchy in Alberta supernaturalism was the only true philosophy of education because it recognized that God was man's final end and that education in school, as well as out of school, must include preparation for the hereafter.

The full text of an address by Dr. J.W. Gilles, Associate Professor of Education, University of Alberta, to the Newman Club, St. Joseph's College, was printed in the December 18, 1949 issue of

the Bulletin. The topic of the address was "A Catholic Philosophy of Education." Gilles began by reminding the students that, since any philosophy of education was based on a philosophy of life, the Catholic philosophy of education was based on the Catholic philosophy of life. He then outlined the seven basic principles of a Catholic philosophy of life.[41] After describing the general aims of education such as self-realization and evaluation, understanding social relationships, economic efficiency and civic responsibility, Gilles proceeded to outline specific Catholic educational aims. According to him, the primary aim of Catholic education was identical with the purpose for which man was created while the secondary aim was to supply the essentials necessary to achieve the primary aim. He added that any secondary educational aims must be consistent with the primary aim which was preparation for man's eternal destiny. Gilles suggested that the best statement of the secondary aims of Catholic education was that prepared in 1940 by the Policies Committee of the American Catholic Education Association chaired by Reverend J. Maline. That committee had decided that the seven broad objectives of Catholic education were to develop intelligent, spiritually vigorous, cultured, healthy, American Catholics who were vocationally prepared and socially-minded.[42] Gilles stated that Catholic aims were more complete, fuller and richer than similar aims in non-Catholic literature. He also observed that Catholic education could only be successfully implemented in Catholic schools and that a Catholic teacher would never find complete satisfaction if he was working in a non-Catholic environment.

It should be noted that the above conclusions were not supported by any evidence. For instance, Gilles did not explain how he came to the conclusion that Catholic educational aims were fuller, richer and more complete; nor did he explain why Catholic schools were necessary and why a Catholic teacher could not find complete professional satisfaction in a non-Catholic school. Therefore, it can be concluded that Gilles was merely expressing opinions which were not substantiated by facts.

The editor of the ACEA Bulletin did not hesitate to reprint sermons or articles from national and international sources if these were relevant to the Catholic theory of schooling or could be of assistance in making Catholics in Alberta aware that Catholics elsewhere were also concerned about maintaining Catholic schools even when they had to do so at tremendous financial sacrifice. For example, on October 24, 1949, the full text of a sermon delivered on April 19, 1949 by the Most Reverend H.L. Lamb, Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, to the annual convention of the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) of the United States, was printed in the ACEA Bulletin. Bishop Lamb's address was similar to the speeches of the Bishops who addressed the ACEA conventions in Alberta. Lamb began his address by reminding the leaders and teachers of Catholic schools in America that they had an important task to perform:

> To you, the leaders and teachers of the Catholic schools of America, the Church has entrusted a task of great importance and heavy responsibility. It involves the temporal and eternal welfare of a great army of youth who look to you for instruction, example and inspiration.[43]

Lamb stressed the importance of religion to the Catholic philosophy of education and added that, for Catholics, any system of education that neglected preparation for the hereafter and omitted God, the soul and eternity was incomplete. He criticized progressive education which he described as a new religion that was only concerned with this world and with the supremacy of the state. In view of this, Lamb regarded Catholic schooling as necessary to the preservation of fundamental liberties in America:

> The Catholic schools of America are the hope of the Church and they are also one of the last citadels defending our fundamental American liberties. We should zealously guard that citadel against the enemies without who are seeking to destroy it. We should protect it from the seepage of secularism and from its friends within the gates who may be tempted to sell their birthright of faith and Catholic culture for a mess of pedagogical pottage.[44]

Lamb clearly advocated the maintenance and strengthening of Catholic schooling through continued religious education, more Catholic schools and support of the principle of Catholic schooling for all Catholic children.

On October 30, 1950 a presentation, given by Father F.R. Richard of Washington D.C. to the annual convention of the NCEA in August of that year, was printed in the Bulletin. The topic of Richard's address was "The Religion Class and Christian Social Living." The concluding statement of his presentation adequately summarized the teachings of the Catholic church with regard to religion and social living:

> In concluding, my dear friends, may I leave in your minds and hearts the following statements:
>
> a. Religion is the soul of the curriculum for Christian social living
> b. Our religion teachers must be Christlike teachers; they must be thoroughly prepared, intellectually and morally for such a task
> c. In the religion class, the accent must be on the knowledge and practice of our Catholic faith and life in the school, home, church and community
> d. The pupil must be active in the acquisition of knowledge, attitudes and habits in Christian social living.[45]

Clearly, the Catholic viewpoint was that religion and social living were closely linked and, once religious instruction was efficiently given, Catholic youths would be fully prepared for participation in Christian social living.

Similar views were expressed by Bishop Carroll of Calgary in the keynote address to the Social Life Conference delivered at the King Edward Hotel, Toronto on Sunday November 18, 1956. Carroll suggested that the question that the Conference should concern itself with was why so many Catholics, who had been reared according to the philosophy of Catholic education, were ignorant of Catholic social principles:

> If the great social encyclicals teach anything, they show that the social question cannot be separated from religion -- that in the words of Pius XI "the reconstruction and perfection of the social order can surely in no way be realized without reform of morality . . ." Every Catholic has the obligation to live the Christian life and to spread the Kingdom of Christ, but these include the social doctrines of the Church. Every Catholic should be social-minded, and an apostle of social justice and charity.[46]

As far as the American Catholic hierarchy and the leaders in Alberta were concerned, religion and Christian social living were closely

linked and could not be taught in isolation from each other. The problem, according to Carroll, was that Catholics who had attended Catholic schools were not practising social justice and charity. Catholic schools were, therefore, failing to prepare Catholics adequately for social living.

The editor of the Bulletin printed current papal statements on teaching and schooling to familiarize ACEA members with the educational views of the reigning pontiff, Pius XII. For example, the February 12, 1954 Bulletin contained an article summarizing Pius XII's radio message to the closing session of the Fifth Inter-American Congress on Catholic education. In addition, on October 5, 1956 the Bulletin printed an address that had been delivered by Pius XII to the International Catechetical Congress in Rome six years earlier. In that address, Pius had pointed out that religious instruction must include everything that was essential to the body of the church's teaching -- dogmas of faith, moral laws and divine worship.[47]

An article by Reverend V.A. Yzermans entitled "The Pope Speaks on Education" was part of the December 2, 1957 Bulletin. The purpose of Yzermans' article was to acknowledge and publicize Pius XII's contributions to educational thought. According to Yzermans, Pius XII had delivered over eighty addresses on education throughout the years of his pontificate. In those addresses the pope had re-stated the aims of Catholic education, warned against the imminent dangers to Catholic education contained in statism, superficial knowledge and ignorance of religious truths and had insisted that religion and education could not be separated.[48] Yzermans credited

Pius XII with recognizing the need for cooperation between home and school and described his addresses as a delineation and explanation of the principles set down by his predecessors:

> Pope Pius XII is no innovator. Rather, he is the builder who has contributed much to the furnishing of the house of Catholic education. By delineating and applying to our day principles enunciated by the Holy See for centuries, he has given parents, teachers and religious a priceless treasure.[49]

The statements by Pius XII and the article by Yzermans provided current papal thoughts on education that further reinforced the Catholic theory of schooling that had been developed since the pontificates of Pius IX and Leo XIII. In addition, they reminded Catholics of the educational teachings of the church and, were therefore, useful to the ACEA in carrying out its function of re-awakening the interest of Catholics in Alberta to those teachings.

Another strategy used by the editor of the Bulletin to remind Catholics of their obligation to work towards total achievement of the educational goals of the church was to reprint relevant articles that had been published in the past. Two examples of these were "Parenthood and the Teacher" and "The Church and the World" reprinted in the April 5 and December 12, 1950 Bulletins respectively. "Parenthood and the Teacher" was written by Reverend F. Valentine and had appeared in The Sower, June 1933 while "The Church and the World" by Reverend M.J. Scott had appeared in Columbia in 1934. Both articles were supportive of the Catholic viewpoint concerning the duties of the Catholic teacher and the mission of the church in education.[50] It is obvious, therefore, that they were utilized by the editor as additional material to support the theme of

Catholic schooling for all Catholic children.

Several articles that discussed the church and education, the Catholic concept of education and the philosophy of Catholic education were printed and circulated to ACEA members in the Bulletin. Three of those articles will be examined here to illustrate the fact that the ideas were the same as those expressed by Catholic writers fifty years earlier. The first of the three articles was entitled "The Catholic Church and Education" and it was written by Reverend Dr. V. Flynn of the United States. With reference to the nature of man, Flynn stated that man had a two-fold nature, material and spiritual and "any view of man which disregards either his spiritual or his corporeal self is unsound."[51] That statement was supportive of the position of the church throughout this study -- that man has spiritual and temporal needs and education must cater to both of those needs. In "The Catholic Concept of Education" Reverend T. Ryan further reinforced this principle:

> The whole teaching of the Catholic Church on the great question of education is founded upon her concept of the nature of man and the end or purpose of his existence on earth . . . She holds that man is a creature composed of body and soul and made to the image and likeness of God, that man is sent into this world to know God and to love Him and to serve Him that, after passing through this life on earth, he may be happy with God forever in eternity.[52]

Since man was composed of body and soul, education had to cater to both his material and spiritual natures. In other words, education must be concerned with the whole man. This was the fundamental premise upon which all Catholic educational thought was based.

The views expressed by Flynn and Ryan were reiterated by Reverend M.J. McGucken in his article, "Essentials in the Philosophy of Catholic Education," published approximately five years later. After reviewing the teachings of the church regarding the nature of man and the supernatural, McGucken discussed the agencies of education (school, family, church), the place of religion in the curriculum and the importance of the hereafter.[53] McGucken's comments were practically the same as the pronouncements made by Leo XIII, Pius XI, Pius XII and the Catholic hierarchy in Canada and the United States throughout the period of this study. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Catholic theory of schooling had remained unchanged throughout the period. What had changed was the attitude of some Catholics who were sending their children to non-Catholic schools in areas where Catholic schools were available and within easy access. Further, public recognition of this attitude by the Church hierarchy was taking place. Since the goal of the ACEA was to reawaken the interest of these Catholics in Catholic schooling for their offspring so that the theory of Catholic schooling could be effectively practised, measures had to be implemented to achieve this goal. One of the measures discussed above was the publication and circulation of materials that reinforced the theory and reminded Catholics of their obligation to support the practice of Catholic schooling.

Another method used by the ACEA to promote interest in the Catholic theory of schooling was the publication and circulation of a "Handbook for Regions" in 1949. The purpose of this handbook was to provide general information concerning the principles of Catholic

education, the aims and objectives of the ACEA and a programme of activities for organizing and holding meetings in established ACEA regions throughout Alberta. The handbook was prepared by members of Region #1, Edmonton and published with the permission of the Central Executive of the ACEA.[54] An outline of seventeen study agenda for meetings in regions was provided; the final activity was to study Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which outlined basic educational rights that should be guaranteed to all and endorsed the right of the parent to choose the kind of education their children should receive.[55]

The editorial of the December 18, 1949 Bulletin was entitled "The Handbook for Regions." That editorial informed members that the handbooks had been printed and copies would shortly be sent to regions that had already been formed. The purpose of the study agenda for meetings was to provide members with a sequential programme of work that covered all the essential aspects of Catholic educational theory:

> It is tremendously important that our Catholic people understand the insistence on Catholic schools which we find in the Sacred Canons of Church Law and again in the encyclicals on education by successive Popes. We are not just left free in the matter of the kind of education our Catholic children are to get. It is a matter of conscience by bishop, pastor and Catholic people.[56]

The editor further suggested that adult Catholics should undertake the study seriously since they were the ones who had to solve the educational problems facing Catholics in Alberta.

According to the Bulletin of May 1, 1951, one of the major topics at the April 1951 ACEA convention was religious education. A panel discussion on religious teaching had taken place during the

convention and papers presented by the panel members were published in the Bulletin. The panelists were Reverend Dr. O. Fuchs of St. Joseph's College, Chairman of the Edmonton Region of the ACEA, Sister M. Irene of the Sacred Heart Convent, Edmonton and Mrs. G. Sutherland of Edmonton who presented a parent's perspective on religious teaching. Dr. Fuchs suggested that a revival of religious instruction was taking place in the homes and schools of Alberta and experiments were being carried out with new religious education methods. Religion was currently being presented as something to be lived rather than as a subject to be memorized as it had been presented in the past. Sister Irene reminded members of the ACEA that the Lord's command to go forth and teach all nations was not only directed to bishops and priests but also to every Catholic since the task of teaching necessitated the coordinated efforts of all Catholics. Therefore, parents had a vital role to perform in religious education and should undertake that duty seriously. In presenting a parent's perspective Mrs. Sutherland supported Sister Irene's position regarding the obligation of parents:

> It is the duty and privilege of parents to supplement the school's instruction by teaching the prayers and the catechism in the home . . . Parents in general do not give adequate religious instruction to their children. A course for parents in how to give this, and daily homework in catechism assigned for all the grades would do much to remedy this.[57]

From the above, it can be concluded that, by 1951, the ACEA recognized the need for improved religious instruction in the home and school and was working towards that goal. The panel presentations at the convention were used to remind members that, for Catholics, religious

education was a necessity; therefore, all Catholics in Alberta should work cooperatively to expand and improve religious teaching in the homes and schools of the province.

Editorials of the Bulletin were often devoted to the problems facing the association in its efforts to revive interest in Catholic education among Catholic parents. In an editorial entitled "Apathy Toward Catholic Education" (April 5, 1950) the editor noted that it would be useless for the ACEA "to continue agitating for Catholic schools or for the teaching of religion in our schools, unless our Catholic people are awakened and made alive to the value of a Catholic school and an all round religious training."[58] Therefore, he exhorted the ACEA regions to work vigorously to arouse Catholics from this lethargy regarding the education of their offspring. In another editorial on October 30, 1950, the editor reiterated the aims of the ACEA and added that:

> Too many of our people are not convinced that Catholic schools and Catholic education are essential. They are now sending their children to neutral schools, and so far as they can judge, all's well . . . But all is far from well. The Canon Law of the Catholic Church very definitely tells us that Catholic children are to be educated in Catholic schools.[59]

The editor was of the opinion that most Catholics did not know what was required by Canon Law, nor what the various popes had said about education. The ACEA regions had to ensure that information concerning those matters was disseminated throughout their regions so that Catholic parents could be made aware of their obligations regarding education. As previously noted, less than three years later a study outline of Pius XI's 1929 encyclical, Divini Ilius Magistri, was

prepared for circulation to all ACEA regions throughout Alberta. This was in keeping with the suggestion made in the above editorial regarding the function of the ACEA as educators of Catholics concerning papal teachings on education.

The editorials throughout this period constantly referred to the complacency of Catholics regarding Catholic schooling and the tremendous task facing the ACEA regions in their attempts to motivate these Catholics to fulfill their responsibilities by supporting Catholic schools. It is obvious from these editorials that some Catholic parents were sending their children to non-Catholic schools because they felt those schools were better-equipped than the Catholic ones. The ACEA was, therefore, faced with the difficult task of convincing parents, who felt that a public school education would provide material benefits for their offspring, that they should send their children to Catholic schools because they would be better for their spiritual welfare. The ACEA had a formidable task. Those Catholic parents seemed to have separated the roles of the church and the school; they had decided that spiritual values should be taught in the home and the church while academic subjects were best handled in a secular atmosphere.

On March 11, 1954, the ACEA submitted a brief entitled "God, the Family and the State in Education" to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Colonization, Immigration and Education, Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta. The authors of the brief quoted from Article 27 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in support of the Catholic belief that the primary right to

educate belongs to the parents rather than the state:

> The parents' duty and responsibility has to do therefore with their children's God-given destiny of a useful and worthwhile life here and a life of happiness hereafter with God. The state in regard to the child has a two-fold function: to assist the parents where necessary in the discharge of their overall duties towards the child and to wisely intervene whenever the parents are remiss in their duties and not acting according to right reason.[60]

In other words, the child was a member of the family prior to being a potential citizen of the state, therefore, the family had primary control over its education.

The concluding paragraph of the brief provided a summation of the ACEA position on education, while implying that practically all Alberta parents shared the views of the ACEA:

> We believe we are speaking not only for the Catholic parents of this Province, but for practically all Alberta parents in emphasizing that any reforms of our educational system, be they with respect to organization, curriculum or teacher shortage, must be made with due regard to the exact but very important role of the teacher, the rights and duties of parents, the subordinate but also important position of the state as a helper only, and the education of the whole man.[61]

It is important to note that the above statement was based on a belief that most Alberta parents felt the way the ACEA did about education rather than any research findings or factual evidence. That kind of unsubstantiated remark was often made by Catholic leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton and other parts of Alberta without any supporting research or statistical data.

As previously stated, a Royal Commission on Education in Alberta was given the mandate to investigate and report on education in Alberta on December 31, 1957. Among the many briefs received by

the commission was one presented by the Alberta Catholic Trustees' Association on April 24, 1958. A summary of ACTA's recommendations was published in the Bulletin of September 30, 1958. After outlining the Catholic theory of education, the authors of the brief then proceeded to enumerate their recommendations regarding schooling in Alberta. Most of the twenty-eight recommendations pertained to financial and other issues that affected the practical operation of Catholic schools, four of them were of particular relevance to Catholic educational theory while several referred indirectly to Catholic educational objectives. Recommendations 11, 12, 15 and 20, included below, were directly related to the propagation of the Catholic theory of schooling:

> 11. We recommend the establishment of a Catholic teacher training institution.
>
> 12. We recommend that until such is established, that courses in Catholic philosophy of education and in religious instruction be incorporated in the curriculum of all undergraduate programs of the Faculty of Education on an equal basis and with credit equivalent to that granted to the philosophical courses now being offered.
>
> 13. We recommend that religious instruction be treated as an "equal" among other subjects on the school timetables; i.e. schools be allowed to schedule religious instruction at any period of the day as other subjects are scheduled.
>
> 20. We recommend that Catholic educators be given the right to recommend a greater number of Catholic books on reference and reading lists as alternatives to those which do not stress in a positive way the spirit of Catholic life.[62]

These four recommendations sought concessions that would enable Catholic schools to move closer to the ideal. For example, the establishment of a Catholic Teachers' Training College and the interim

recognition of Catholic philosophy courses as part of teacher training would result in Catholic teachers being better prepared for providing religious and other courses to Catholic children. In addition, a flexible time for religious instruction and Catholic reference and reading lists would give Catholic religious and lay educators greater scope for practical implementation of the Catholic theory of schooling. Therefore, the ACTA brief was a significant document that would definitely have been approved by the ACEA and the religious leaders in the Archdiocese of Edmonton as well as the rest of the province.

As stated previously, the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta were officially released in November, 1959. On December 3, 1959 the editorial of the ACEA Bulletin contained a reprint of an editorial from the November 17, 1959 issue of the Edmonton Journal which the ACEA editor described as the best editorial comment on Mr. J.S. Cormack's Minority Report. The title of the editorial was "Quality and Essentials in School." The editor quoted several excerpts from the Minority Report which advocated an essentialist or traditionalist approach to schooling rather than the then popular progressivist approach. He concluded his editorial with the following statement regarding Mr. Cormack's report:

> A few excerpts cannot do justice to a minority report of one hundred and seventy pages but these indicate that Mr. Cormack's views are worthy of careful consideration by parents in this province and by the government. He is to be congratulated on his good judgment and very valuable contribution to the work of the commission, and for his courage in grasping and naming the real problem which confronted it.[63]

Although the Edmonton Journal editorial on Cormack's Minority Report did not discuss religious education, it was viewed favourably by the editor of the ACEA Bulletin because the editor supported Cormack's traditionalist position on schooling which the Catholic hierarchy also supported. It should be noted that Cormack did not discuss the Catholic theory of schooling in his report. In fact, he described separate schools as "a democratic check on an otherwise monolithic system" that provided "a reaffirmation of the prior right of parents to determine the kind of education which their children shall receive."[64] His main concerns were that there should be pluralism in education to avoid total state control, free parental choice on the kind of education a child should have and teaching of the fundamentals in education. In other words, he favoured the essentialist or traditionalist approach to schooling as opposed to the progressivist position. His view was that the aim of education should be:

> To transmit the intellectual and cultural heritage and knowledge of a race and, in the process, to teach young people to think and to buttress moral values. An acquisition of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, the developing of the intellect, the disciplining and developing of all mental processes, after which the other factors such as appreciation, interests, and earning a living will fall automatically into place.[65]

Cormack's report was, therefore, not a reaffirmation of the Catholic theory of schooling but rather a critique of progressive education and of complete state control of schooling. It can be concluded that the ACEA supported Cormack's position because it was similar to theirs in its condemnation of progressivism, support for parental

rights and opposition to a monolithic school system even though it did not include any references to or reaffirmation of the Catholic theory of schooling.

In the next issue of the Bulletin, Chapter 30 of the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta was reviewed. Chapter 30 of the Report dealt with issues and recommendations regarding separate schools in Alberta. The editor of the Bulletin stated that he was amazed and dumbfounded by the evident bias displayed by the commissioners in discussing Catholic separate school practices and problems. The following statement was presented as evidence of that bias:

> The Catholic Separate School idea, as made apparent to the Commission through briefs and hearings, would be realized most fully under certain conditions. Fundamentally, an intimate relationship must be established between the Church and education, the latter being subject to conduct and interpretation specifically conceived by the Church to serve its own ends. This relationship can be established only if Catholic children are segregated from others, if they are taught by specially-trained Catholic teachers and with a school environment rich in religious symbols and exercises.[66]

The editor of the Bulletin regarded the phrase "to serve its own ends" as an unjust, biased description of the educational motives of the Catholic church in Alberta. Exception was also taken to the use of the word "segregation" and the phrase "a school environment rich in religious symbols and exercises." The editor regarded those comments as fuel for bigots who were intolerant of religious freedom. The Majority Report also described separate schools as divisive and suggested that there should be greater harmony between groups in society rather than segregated education. It can be observed that

the editorial commentary in the ACEA Bulletin was emotional rather than factual. The five commissioners had presented an accurate picture of Catholic schooling in Alberta; their comments could be substantiated by the facts of the situation. It was true that Catholic children were segregated for educational purposes, the motives of the church in advocating religious education were self-serving and religious symbols and exercises were used in the schools. Although Catholic leaders and educators endorsed these practices they eloquently expressed indignation when outsiders observed and commented on those aspects of Catholic schooling.

The editorials, articles and other materials published in the ACEA Bulletin over the period 1947 to 1960 reinforced the Catholic theory of schooling and highlighted problems faced by Catholic educators in Alberta in maintaining, expanding and improving Catholic school facilities in the province. The ACEA and the leaders of the Catholic church in Alberta recognized that Catholic schools in Alberta were not close to the Catholic ideal of schooling. They also recognized that many Catholics had become indifferent to Catholic schooling and were sending their children to neutral public schools. They regarded progressive education as inadequate and pragmatism as a false philosophy. Their aim was to uphold traditional values in education while working towards reviving the interest of Catholic parents in Catholic schooling. They used the method of study groups in regions to propagate the Catholic theory of schooling and philosophy of life in their efforts to win back the indifferent into the fold. The executive of the ACEA worked tirelessly to

achieve their objective. The Bulletin and ACEA Pamphlet were used effectively for propaganda purposes. However, since no independent evaluation of the achievements of the ACEA was carried out, it is not possible to ascertain how successful the association was in its campaign to resuscitate interest in the theory and practice of Catholic schooling in Alberta.

Another source of information for the theory of Catholic schooling in this period was the Western Catholic. In the next section "Catholic Truth Broadcasts" and other speeches related to education, editorials, articles and reports, that were published in the Western Catholic between 1947 and 1960, will be reviewed. It is anticipated that these materials will provide further reinforcement of the theory of schooling and recognition of the problems facing Catholic educators by the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Western Catholic Materials, 1947-1960

The Western Catholic, the official organ of the Catholic church in the Archdiocese of Edmonton and the Diocese of Calgary, continued its policy of support for the Catholic theory of schooling throughout this period. The texts of "Catholic Truth Broadcasts," statements by Pope Pius XII and other articles and reports that discussed education were often found in the pages of this weekly newspaper. The ACEA was fully endorsed by the Western Catholic and editorials often commended the ACEA for its contributions to the growth of Catholic education.

The "Catholic Truth Broadcast" programme was aired on CFRN radio in Edmonton and the texts of the addresses were printed in the Western Catholic. On September 30, 1953 the Western Catholic published the text of an address delivered by Archbishop MacDonald on the "Catholic Truth Broadcast" the previous Sunday. The theme of MacDonald's address was the need for complete religious education. He suggested that education without religion was inadequate; therefore, there should be a combination of secular and religious education in the schools:

> The fact that we are insisting on religion as a necessary element in education does not mean that we belittle the importance of secular subjects. These are necessary to earn a living for ourselves and those dependent upon us . . . But there would be no sense in stopping there, when both reason and revelation tell us of the existence of a Supreme Master and the various duties we owe to Him.[67]

MacDonald was clearly reaffirming that religion and education were inseparable, therefore, there should be religious instruction and a religious atmosphere in all Catholic schools.

Another radio talk in the same series, delivered by Reverend J.A. MacLellan on Sunday March 7, 1954, was printed in the Western Catholic of March 10, 1954. The title of the address was "Education Week" and MacLellan reminded his listeners that, because the Catholic church realized that the soul as well as the body of the child should be educated, Catholic schools were a necessity. He added that "the great cornerstone of Catholic education is belief in God, in God Incarnate -- Jesus Christ -- in the Church as official custodian of the truths once and for all delivered to the Saints."[68] Catholics were, therefore, charged with the duty and responsibility of

providing their children with an education that was in keeping with these Christian truths. That type of education would also prepare them to discharge their duties as citizens worthily and conduct themselves meritoriously in preparation for their eternal destiny. Both MacDonald and MacLennan were re-emphasizing a basic theme of the Catholic theory of schooling -- that religion and education could not be separated.

There can be no doubt that the Catholic hierarchy in Alberta was adhering to papal convictions regarding education when they insisted that religion should be taught in school and that a religious atmosphere should permeate the entire school. Evidence that this was still a major theme of Catholic educational theory could be found in statements made by Pius XII which were quoted in the Western Catholic. On October 11, 1948 Pius XII exhorted Catholic school teachers to fight against "the pernicious present day tendencies to separate religion from education, and to oppose the exaggerated importance given to technical and material studies."[69] Again, in a radio address to the closing session of the fourth Inter-American Congress on Catholic education held in Brazil in August 1951, Pius declared:

> Education which is not moral and religious is mutilated in its highest and greatest function. It neglects the noblest faculties of man, deprives itself of the most efficacious and vital energies and ends by diseducating, by mixing errors and uncertainties with truth, vice and virtue and evil with good.[70]

Similar statements were made by the pope to the first international congress of teaching nuns in Vatican City on September 15, 1951. Therefore, it can be concluded that the welding of religious and

intellectual instruction was still a major theme of Catholic educational theory and that the pope and the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton were in agreement concerning the importance of that theme.

The American Catholic educational hierarchy also endorsed this position. An address by retiring NCEA president, Dr. G.F. Zook, to the NCEA convention in Chicago on May 11, 1951, provided an example of this concurrence with the official Catholic pronouncements regarding religion and education:

> One of the most distressing developments of the past century has been the growing tendency to separate education and religion as if they had little in common . . . The values and qualities of religion and democracy respectively are so similar and interrelated that they ought to be regarded by educators, by ministers of religion, and by the public as partners in perfecting the individual.[71]

Western Catholic editorials were another source of information regarding the educational views of the religious hierarchy of the Archdiocese of Edmonton. Since clerics served as editors of this newspaper for approximately thirty-three of the thirty-nine years since its introduction (1921-1960), it follows that the editorials would be supportive of the views of the Catholic leaders of Alberta. Moreover, the activities of the ACEA were fully supported by editorials of the Western Catholic.

On June 29, 1949 the Western Catholic editorial was entitled "The ACEA." The editor expressed concern that the ACEA was not as well-known to the people of Alberta as it should be. To assist in familiarizing Catholics with the role of that association, he had decided to provide a review of the objectives of the ACEA and the tasks it had undertaken since its formation in 1947. He suggested that

it was necessary that Catholics become aware of the work of the association if the threat of neutral education was to be overcome:

> Our Catholic people must be roused to a new and greater interest in Catholic education and schools. The neutral and Godless school is a threat to religion and all things which we cherish as our Christian inheritance. The ACEA can do a great deal but unless it is supported by our Catholic people, its every effort will prove in vain.[72]

Like the Catholic hierarchy in the Archdiocese and the ACEA leaders, the editor acknowledged that many Catholics in Alberta were apathetic with reference to Catholic schooling for their children. Therefore, he urged them to support the ACEA in its work so that the threat of Godless schools could be overcome.

Again, in an editorial written about a week before the 1950 ACEA convention, the editor informed readers that an ACEA convention would be held the following week, named some of the persons who would be speaking at the convention and the themes they would be addressing, reminded Catholics of the importance of the work of the ACEA and on behalf of the Western Catholic, extended the wish that the ACEA would have a successful convention.[73] It is apparent that the editor of the Western Catholic endorsed and ardently supported the activities of the ACEA.

Similarly, in another editorial, that announced the dates of the 1953 ACEA convention, the editor noted that:

> The ACEA is to be highly commended for the work it has been doing over the years since its inception. That it has been able to carry on at all in the face of much apathy on the part of most of our Catholic people is something we have marvelled at during all the years of its existence.[74]

Similar editorial comments were made concerning the work of the ACEA throughout this period. In addition, in Western Catholic reports of ACEA conventions, the words successful or outstanding were invariably used to describe the conventions. Therefore, it can be concluded that the editor of the Western Catholic supported the work of the ACEA and regarded their annual conventions as educationally sound and extremely successful. The question left unanswered was, if their conventions were so fruitful and their educational study groups growing and reawakening interest in Catholicism, had they been successful in stemming the tide of apathy and in convincing parents that Catholic children should be in Catholic schools? In fact, since no research findings nor statistical data were available, there was no evidence to indicate that any change in parental attitudes had come about because of ACEA activities.

The editorials of the Western Catholic also focussed on the responsibilities of Catholic parents regarding the formal education of their children. Editorials on this theme were mainly written the week before school reopened for the new school year. They served as a reminder to Catholic parents that they had an obligation to send their children to Catholic schools if these were available, that many Catholics (particularly in the United States) were doing so at tremendous personal and financial sacrifice and that parents were responsible for the religious and moral training of their children in the pre-school years.[75] In the September 6, 1950 editorial parents were also cautioned not to take sides with their children against teachers. Rather, they should assist the teachers by ensuring that

their children completed homework assignments, supervising their out-of-school activities and getting to know their friends and close associates. These editorials reinforced the theme of every Catholic child in a Catholic school and stressed the necessity for close cooperation between parents and teachers.

In an editorial written to commemorate Education Week in 1954 parents were reminded of their educational responsibilities:

> The education of children is primarily the responsibility of parents. Only secondarily and by virtue of parental delegation does it become the responsibility of teachers. Both parents and teachers have their full part to play in the educative process.[76]

Further elaboration of the role of the parent in the educative process was given in the editorial "As The Tree is Bent" the following week. The editor contended that Catholics in Alberta had fine schools and many excellent teachers but they played a secondary role to that of the home and parents.[77] If parents did not provide appropriate early training the school's job would become very difficult. Parents, as the first educators, had a responsibility to provide proper Christian instruction in the formative years.

It can be concluded that, during the period 1947-1960, the editorials of the Western Catholic supported the ACEA and approved of their work, accepted the Catholic theory of schooling and criticized parents who neglected their primary educational duties as Catholics. The editor suggested that many Catholics were failing to send their children to Catholic schools. According to him, those parents were failing in their spiritual preparation of their offspring. He served as their conscience by reminding them of their duty to ensure

that their children received Catholic schooling and of their obligation to support the work of the Catholic schools. In other words, the editor was endorsing the position of the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton regarding the importance of Catholic schooling.

As previously stated the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (Minority Report) 1959 was presented by a Catholic layman, J.S. Cormack. Cormack did not provide a Catholic perspective on schooling. In fact, his comments could be interpreted as non-sectarian because he described Catholic or any other denominational schools as instructional alternatives. As discussed earlier, he was an advocate of a traditional as opposed to progressive perspective on schooling. However, the Catholic hierarchy welcomed Cormack's Report and regarded it as a vindication of their position on schooling.

The final article that will be discussed in this section was written by Reverend C.J. Foran in response to Cormack's Report. Foran stated that Cormack's Report showed evidence of intensive research, defended the traditionalist point of view regarding education and emphasized parental educational rights. While he agreed in principle with Cormack's conclusions, Foran suggested that Cormack's advocacy of pluralism was ill-timed:

> We are not living in a perfect society. We need not expect to live under ideal conditions. Nearly always, minorities are subject to discrimination of one kind or another. This is a situation with which they must learn to live until such time as the disabilities can be removed by patient, prudent and sometimes prolonged negotiations. Negotiation rather than agitation is the way to better understanding.[78]

The last sentence of Foran's statement is reminiscent of the views expressed by Leo XIII in his encyclical to Canadian bishops in 1897 regarding the line of action that should be taken in regaining school rights lost in Manitoba. Leo XIII had recommended continued negotiation rather than agitation. Foran's advocacy of negotiation rather than agitation was in keeping with the position taken by Archbishop Legal in his negotiations with the Alberta Liberal government between 1905 and 1920. Leduc had advocated a policy of confrontation in his 1896 treatise (Hostility Unmasked), but Legal adhered to the route of compromise and negotiation suggested by Leo XIII. It is significant that, more than fifty years later, Foran was suggesting the same kind of approach. The position of the Catholic hierarchy with regard to consultation with the government over schooling issues and the Catholic theory of schooling had remained unchanged from the 1890's to 1960.

The final set of documents to be examined are the Minutes of ACSTA (1958-1960) and those of the Edmonton, Red Deer, Wainwright, Vegreville separate and St. Albert public school districts (1947-1960). The ACSTA Minutes will be researched for references to the Catholic theory of schooling and actions taken by that association to further the cause of Catholic schooling in Alberta. The information contained in the Minutes of the school districts will be researched for discussions of schooling theory as well as references to the work of Catholic religious personnel in the schools.

Minutes -- ACSTA (1958-1960), Catholic School Districts (1947-1960)

Prior to the formation of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association (ACSTA) in 1958 Catholic trustees had met in a private session and held a banquet for Catholic trustees and their guests during the regular, annual conventions of the Alberta School Trustees' Association (ASTA). There was no formal move to establish a separate branch of the trustees association for Catholic trustees until 1957. At the 1957 ASTA convention, the Catholic trustees held their usual meeting during the course of which they chose an executive for the Catholic section of ASTA. However, the ACSTA was not formally constituted at that time. An inaugural meeting of the newly-appointed executive was held on January 25, 1958. The purpose of that meeting was to continue the work begun at the November convention for the formal establishment of a Catholic section of ASTA with its own constitution and by-laws. This was officially recognized on November 6, 1958 with the passing of a by-law at the ASTA convention that officially constituted a Roman Catholic branch of ASTA.[79] On November 7, the Catholic trustees ratified the constitution which they had drafted within the terms of reference granted to them by ASTA. Thus, the ACSTA was formally established at the 1958 ASTA convention.

At the ACSTA executive meeting of January 25, 1958 committees had been established with the responsibility of making recommendations regarding several areas of interest to Catholic educators. Three of these were the Royal Commission Brief Committee, the Teacher Training Recruitment and Retention Committee and the Separate Schools Problems Committee. The brief to the Royal Commission would present the

Catholic theory and practice of schooling and recommend measures that could be taken to improve the quality of Catholic schooling. Further, the committee for teacher training, recruitment and retention would be concerned with standards for the training of Catholic teachers and ways of recruiting properly trained personnel and of encouraging these teachers to remain in the Catholic system. The work of the Separate Schools Problems Committee would definitely overlap with that of the other two since both of them would be recommending ways of alleviating existing separate school problems.

On November 5, 1958 a resolution regarding religious education was tabled at the ACSTA convention. The preamble, resolution and explanation of terms read as follows:

> Whereas the "Raison D'Etre" of Separate Schools is for imparting of religious instruction in addition to the academic curriculum, and
> Whereas teachers should be qualified for the imparting of such religious instruction as an essential part of a Roman Catholic Separate School Curriculum.
> Therefore Be It Resolved: That the ACSTA obtain a Graded, Proven, and Ecclesiastically Approved course for this purpose and secure the Professional Personnel to conduct it.
> Be It Further Resolved: That when resolution one has been accomplished, the ACSTA Petition the Department of Education to accept these courses and grant academic credits to those enrolled in such courses successfully.
>
> Explanation of Terms
>
> Graded: With one year course: one Summer School: A program of methodology and content Further summer school courses; Apologetics, Scholastic Philosophy, Catholic Philosophy and Theology of Education, Church History and Education.
> Proven: One that has been used successfully in one or other Catholic Teachers' Training Institution.

Ecclesiastically Approved: by the Bishops of Alberta
Professional Personnel: line up possible instructor.[80]

An examination of the above resolution and explanation of terms has revealed that, like the ACEA and the Catholic hierarchy, members of ACSTA accepted the Catholic tenet that religion must be part of the school curriculum but recognized that many Catholic teachers were inadequately prepared for teaching religion in Catholic schools. Their resolution suggested a method of improving the quality of teacher preparation for teaching religion. It should also be noted that the program proposed in the resolution would only be implemented if it was acceptable to the Bishops of Alberta. Therefore, the Catholic hierarchy in Alberta was regarded as the ultimate authority with power to veto any programme of religious education that was not in keeping with the Catholic theory of schooling or philosophy of life.

The principal address at the ACSTA Convention of November 1958 was delivered by Bishop Carroll. Carroll re-emphasized the natural right of parents in education and added that the courses of study and standards of public and separate schools in Alberta were the same except for religious education:

> Religious education, in the Catholic view, concerns itself not only with religious knowledge but with the development of the whole Christian character. Just as every human action must be controlled and directed towards our eternal destiny so every form of instruction is related in some way or other to that same purpose of serving God in this world and of enjoying Him in the next . . . The religious atmosphere of the classrooms, the coordination of secular subjects and religion, the constant practice of religion by teachers and pupils -- all these enter

> into a Christian education and deserve the attention, the interest and the zeal of the School Board.[81]

Carroll was reiterating the basic themes of permeation and the proper relationship that should exist between secular and religious education which had been enunciated by the papal authorities in the nineteenth century and endorsed by the North American Catholic hierarchy. Carroll recognized that the Catholic trustees were performing an important function and urged them to remember that they were representing both parents and the government. As representatives of the government they had to ensure that the schools were efficiently organized and that requirements regarding curricula, equipment and methods were met. Further, as representatives of Catholic parents they had to ensure that Catholic children were given an education that was in keeping with the Catholic theory of schooling. In other words, trustees had the dual responsibility of keeping both the state and parents satisfied with the type of education children were receiving.

According to ACSTA, the major document that negatively affected the Catholic theory of schooling was the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (1959). That Report was mentioned at several ACSTA executive meetings between December 1959 and April 1960. At the meeting of April 21, 1960 the trustees decided that, in view of the fact that their brief to the Royal Commission had been ignored by the authors of the Majority Report, they would draft a new brief bringing their grievances up to date and circulate it to boards for approval. This brief would then be

submitted to the Premier and the Education Minister of Alberta. In addition, boards were encouraged "to write themselves and encourage others to write local MLA's with copies for provincial executive office ACSTA and Minister of Education"[82] outlining their grievances which had been ignored by the majority commissioners. Another activity that the ACSTA executive intended to undertake was the formation of study groups in various centres using the "Trustees Brief to the Royal Commission, ATA Digest of Cameron Commission Report and Bishops' Pastoral Letter of March 6 as text."[83] The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that Catholics understood the implications of the Majority Report for Catholic schooling in Alberta. Once they understood the issues they would be able to effectively oppose any attempts to abolish existing separate school rights.

The ACSTA Minutes (1958-1960) did not provide direct references to the Catholic theory of schooling. However, from the issues discussed, it is apparent that ACSTA regarded religious education as an essential component of Catholic schooling, felt that Catholic teachers were ill-prepared for this aspect of their profession and acknowledged that the religious hierarchy possessed the expertise for making decisions regarding religious education. The members of ACSTA were lay and religious Catholics, and were, therefore, interested in maintaining Catholic schooling in Alberta. Further, they had the difficult task of providing a system of schooling that would satisfy the religious hierarchy, Catholic parents and the state. In other words, they had to ensure that the theory of Catholic

schooling was practically applied while catering to the academic and vocational demands of the parents and the state.

The Minutes of school districts, (1947-1960), provided little information regarding the Catholic theory of schooling. Nevertheless, there were some comments that could be construed as relevant to or supportive of Catholic ideals in education. Several reasons could be advanced for the lack of discussion of Catholic schooling theory at meetings of the various boards. It could be argued that trustees agreed with the existing theory and were more concerned about implementing it practically. Another reason that could be advanced was that they had many practical problems to face regarding administration of the school districts and were more concerned with finding solutions to those issues. However, these arguments are merely speculative for there are no documents, speeches or other materials that outline the views of trustees regarding the Catholic theory of schooling. Nevertheless, analysis of statements made at board meetings could yield some information regarding the attitude of members to some of the themes of Catholic schooling theory and to the leaders who supported that theory.

At the meeting of the Edmonton Separate School Board held on May 14, 1951, the superintendent presented a progress report regarding the work of a committee comprising:

> Special Committees of teachers, His Grace, Archbishop MacDonald and himself toward the revision of the Religious Education Programme to be taught in the Separate Schools. It was moved by Mr. Crowe that this revision, as outlined by the Superintendent and recommended by His Grace, be approved.[84]

The influence of the hierarchy on religious education in Catholic schools was indeed quite marked. Not only was the Archbishop a member of the above-mentioned special committee but his approval had to be obtained before the revised program could be implemented. The question of improved training for Catholic teachers was discussed at the meeting of February 25, 1959 when a proposal for a Junior College for training Catholic teachers was tabled.[85] Since the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta had not yet responded to Catholic proposals, the trustees decided that discussion regarding the Junior College proposal would be postponed pending the outcome of the deliberations of the Royal Commission. From the two references above it is obvious that the members of the Edmonton Separate School Board thought that the religious education course in Edmonton separate schools was inadequate and supported the introduction of the revised programme which had been approved by the Archbishop. In addition, they supported the hierarchical position that many lay teachers were inadequately trained for teaching religion. Further, the members of the Edmonton Separate School Board shared the view of the Catholic hierarchy that religious education should be a basic component of schooling for all Catholic children.

Minutes for the St. Albert Public School District were unavailable for the period 1947-1957. This problem arose because, during the years 1942-1957, the St. Albert School District was part of the Sturgeon School Division so all records would have been kept in the Sturgeon School Division. The Minutes for the period 1958-1960 (after the St. Albert Public School District began

operating independently again) yielded no information relevant to the Catholic theory of schooling. The main topics discussed at meetings were accounts, hiring of staff and other administrative matters affecting the operation of schools. However, it should not be concluded that the Catholic theory of schooling was not important to the St. Albert Public School trustees. Rather, it can be assumed that the trustees left the implementation of the Catholic theory of schooling to the principal and staff and concentrated on the more practical issues affecting administration of the district.

The Minutes of the Red Deer Separate School District for this period contained no direct information regarding the Catholic theory of schooling. In fact, no references to religion were made between 1947 and 1952. The main topics discussed during those years were the hiring of staff, resignations and the building/repairs of schools. It is possible that the school boards members assumed that the Catholic theory of schooling was already permeating the system. Be that as it may, the first direct reference to religion for this period was made at the meeting of March 13, 1952 when it was reported that "Reverend Father Butts offered to visit the schools for the purpose of offering religious instruction. The Board highly recommended this service."[86] Further, the following year the record showed that it was:

> Moved by Dr. Patterson seconded by A. Mitchell that the Secretary follow up the suggestion offered by the Archbishop and Father Woodhouse re -- having Father Butts obtaining a teaching certificate and teaching in the separate schools of Red Deer.[87]

It should be noted that the motion was unanimously carried by the board members. It is obvious that the members of the Red Deer Separate School Board were of the opinion that the religious component of Catholic schooling would be better administered if religious personnel were actively involved in teaching in the schools.

The high regard in which the archbishop was held by the trustees of Red Deer was best exemplified by two decisions taken at meetings over the naming of schools. At the board meeting of August 8, 1956 the name Maryview was suggested by Sister Mary for a new school being established in the Red Deer Separate School District. The motion that followed the suggestion -- "that the new school be named Maryview, subject to the approval of the Archbishop"[88] -- was unanimously carried. At a subsequent meeting it was reported that the Archbishop of Edmonton had approved the name. A similar line of action was taken when it was decided to name the Red Deer High School. It was moved that the high school be named St. Thomas Aquinas but that the name should not be considered official until the Archbishop had given his approval.[89] These two examples have been used to illustrate the fact that the trustees of this district regarded the Archbishop of Edmonton as the ultimate authority on all the religious aspects of schooling from naming of schools to the religious education curriculum. Moreover, the archbishop had the authority to veto any proposals regarding the religious aspects of schooling. This willingness on the part of trustees to accept the archbishop's decisions on religious education as final was not unusual. In the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church the Archbishop of

Edmonton was the foremost authority in the Archdiocese. Therefore, if elected Catholic trustees refused to accept his authority over religious education they would be violating basic Catholic principles and defying the laws of the church. Their acceptance of the archbishop's authority was normal for it was in keeping with their duties as Catholics.

Another example of reliance on religious leaders for guidance in matters related to schooling could be found in the Minutes of the Red Deer Separate School Board meeting of March 23, 1959. There had been discussion of the need for another Catholic high school in Red Deer. The outcome of the discussion was the following motion:

> Dr. Patterson moved that we contact Father Woodhouse for his opinion as to what procedure should be taken to approach the Christian Brothers or the Basilian Fathers to come to Red Deer to provide a high school.[90]

The motion was seconded by Mr. Crowe and was carried unanimously. Religious leaders were, therefore, consulted on several aspects of Catholic schooling in the Red Deer Separate School District. They were asked for advice or opinions regarding the establishment and naming of new schools, the revision of the religious education curriculum and other related matters. Hence, even though the Catholic theory of schooling was not discussed at the meetings of the board, the influence of the religious hierarchy ensured that the Catholic theory of schooling would be practically applied whenever possible.

Like those of the Edmonton and Red Deer Separate School Boards, the Minutes of the Wainwright Separate School Board (1947-1960) contained no direct references to or definition of the Catholic

theory of schooling. However, it was clearly established by trustees that they wanted more religious personnel to teach in the schools. In addition, the practice of consulting members of the religious hierarchy about school affairs that was employed at Red Deer was also utilized by the Wainwright trustees.

An interesting feature of the Wainwright Minutes was the annual practice of moving a vote of thanks to the sisters for the splendid work done in the school the preceding year. The commendation to the sisters was usually expressed at the annual general meeting in February and a letter expressing the board's appreciation was subsequently dispatched to the Reverend Sisters of St. Joseph who were responsible for the administration of the school. On one of these occasions it was recorded that:

> L. Killoran thanked the Sisters, not only for their good work in the school, but also for their great help in keeping the school in operation. The Sisters are the backbone of the whole separate school set up and it could not be operated without them.[91]

It is evident from the above tribute that the sisters were held in high esteem by the Wainwright Separate School Board members. Obviously, they felt that the sisters were ideal teachers since they possessed the skills to administer to the academic needs as well as the religious training of Catholic youths.

The influence of the religious hierarchy on the organization, maintenance and growth of separate school districts cannot be underestimated. Catholic schools were established and survived in many parts of Alberta because of the enthusiasm and support of the local religious leaders as well as the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton.

Dedicated educators from religious orders worked tirelessly to advance the cause of Catholic education through committees and other practical activities. Many of the clerics travelled to various school districts to discuss problems that affected Catholic schools and give advice regarding action that could be taken to improve the quality of the existing schools. Father C. Kindervater, a Catholic educator in the Fairview area during this period, was an example of one of these educators. On July 26, 1953 Kindervater attended a meeting of the Wainwright Separate School Board. Although the minutes of that meeting did not indicate why he had been present, the following excerpt from those minutes suggests that he was highly regarded:

> Father Kindervater of Fairview was present. He is a member of the Bishops Committee on education, and is well versed on school affairs in the province of Alberta, especially with all matters concerning Separate and Catholic schools in the province.[92]

Since Kindervater was an authority on Catholic educational matters in the province, his presence at the Wainwright meeting indicated that he was either providing information or offering advice to the board members. It should also be noted that the archbishop was consulted on any major issues affecting schooling. For example, when one of the trustees proposed that brothers should be recruited to teach in the Wainwright school, it was decided that a letter be written to the archbishop seeking his assistance in obtaining religious brothers to teach in the district.

The theory of Catholic schooling was neither developed nor discussed at meetings of the Wainwright Separate School Board.

However, it would be correct to state that most of the teachers were nuns and the Archbishop of Edmonton, parish priest and clerical educators were influential in shaping schooling policy in that district. Since the nuns and the clergy advocated the practical application of the Catholic theory of schooling, it can be concluded that the Wainwright Separate School Board members were proponents of the same theory. The religious and lay administrators of Catholic schooling in Wainwright seemed to be in complete accord regarding the Catholic theory of schooling.

The Vegreville Separate School District was another Catholic district under the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Edmonton. Although the school district had existed since 1906 there were no Minutes available prior to 1948 because one set of Minutes had been misplaced and attempts to trace it proved to be futile. As was the case in Red Deer and Wainwright, the members of the Vegreville school board relied on the archbishop and other clerics for advice and guidance on issues affecting Catholic schooling.

During the early months of 1948, there had been discussion at meetings of the Vegreville Separate School Board concerning the possibility of employing a teacher of Ukrainian origin to teach in St. Martin's school. Because of the lack of consensus among members it was decided that Father Burke, one of the members, would write Archbishop MacDonald seeking his counsel concerning the employment of a teacher of Ukrainian origin for September 1948. At the meeting of June 11, 1948 the archbishop's reply was read by the secretary of the school district:

> As the Order of the Sisters of Providence had made many sacrifices to establish and supply teachers for some many years, it was or should unquestioningly be their privilege to supply the want of another teacher. On the other hand, if at any future time such a need could not be supplied by the Sisters of Providence, then the Board could well see fit to engage a Ukrainian teacher.[93]

It was recorded in the Minutes that the archbishop's reply settled the matter unanimously. In other words, his advice was accepted and the Sisters of Providence were asked to supply a teacher for September 1948. This is an example of the way in which the Archbishop of Edmonton influenced Catholic schooling within the Archdiocese. He was, unquestionably, the ultimate authority concerning matters affecting Catholic schooling whenever the trustees could not agree on a particular course of action.

Another problem related to Catholic schooling that was raised at meetings of the Vegreville Separate School Board was the time of day set aside for religious instruction. This question was discussed at several meetings between August 1958 and February 1959. It was suggested that religious education should be given in the mornings rather than the last half-an-hour of the school day since students were more alert and receptive in the mornings. However, in view of the fact that Catholics were hoping that the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta would recommend that religious instruction become part of the Department of Education curriculum throughout the province, no line of action was proposed at that time.

The final discussion indirectly related to the Catholic theory of schooling recorded for this period took place at the meeting of

October 19, 1960. The secretary had advised members present that a seminar on the teaching of catechism would be held in Edmonton from October 22 to 25. It was decided by the trustees that "2 lay teachers attend the 4 day seminar and sisters attend on Saturday and Sunday."[94] It was significant that the lay teachers were required to attend the entire seminar while the sisters were only requested to attend the final two days. Obviously the trustees felt that years of religious training had prepared the sisters fairly well for teaching catechism whereas the inadequately trained lay teachers needed more intensive refresher programmes. It can be concluded that, the Vegreville Separate School Board accepted the Catholic theory of schooling, recognized the need for improved religious education and supported efforts to implement the Catholic theory of schooling even though theoretical issues were not debated at school board meetings.

From the minutes examined above it is apparent that the Catholic school boards were more concerned with practical problems and did not indulge in debates on theoretical issues. However, because of the obvious deference to the archbishop, priests, nuns and other members of the religious hierarchy in the available records for these districts, it can be concluded that the trustees accepted the theory of Catholic schooling espoused by the Catholic hierarchy in the Archdiocese unquestioningly. The fact that the archbishop was consulted on issues ranging from naming of a school to hiring of a teacher of a particular origin is evidence of the esteem in which he was held and the role he played as the supreme Archdiocesan authority. Therefore, even though direct references were not made to the Catholic

theory of schooling, members of the Edmonton, Red Deer, Wainwright and Vegreville Separate and the St. Albert Public School Boards supported the Catholic theory of schooling which had been enunciated by the popes and accepted by the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

Conclusion

The materials examined in this chapter have provided no evidence of a change in the Catholic theory of schooling during this period. The pastoral letters and speeches by the archbishop and bishops of Alberta and sister provinces at ACEA conventions reinforced the existing theory. The divine educative mission of the church, the primary right of parents to educate, the delegation of this right to the school and the secondary role of the state in schooling were themes often repeated by the Catholic hierarchy in their letters or speeches.

The Bulletins of the ACEA also supported the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling that had evolved in the North West Territories between 1884 and 1905. However, analysis of the statements, goals and line of action of the ACEA suggested that, even though the religious leaders within the Archdiocese had been insisting that the Catholic ideals of schooling should be practised in all Catholic schools, many Catholic parents were neglecting their duty to provide Catholic training for their children at home and ensure that this training continued by enrolling them in Catholic schools. This meant that the Catholic theory had remained unchanged,

but problems were being encountered with the practical application of the theory. Parents appeared to be less concerned about religious training in the schools and more interested in an improved academic programme. Therefore, the ACEA was faced with the formidable task of reviving interest in Catholic schooling among parents who appeared to be apathetic about religious education and were opting for material rather than spiritual values in education. In addition, those parents also seemed to be influenced by progressive educational theory -- a theory that was condemned and opposed by the traditionalist Catholic hierarchy.

The Pamphlets of the ACEA and the materials selected from the Western Catholic had a great deal in common. They consisted mainly of speeches, articles and other pronouncements by members of the religious establishment who were reiterating the basic themes of the Catholic theory of schooling. The religious leaders still maintained that Catholic schools were superior to secular ones and Catholic parents who sent their children to secular schools in areas where Catholic schools were available were failing in their obligation to their children. In other words, the leaders were reinforcing the status quo of Catholic schooling rather than seeking to determine why many Catholic parents were finding Catholic schools inadequate.

Two other issues were raised by Catholic spokesmen -- the necessity for "social action" education and the importance of safeguarding Catholic youth from the evils of pragmatism and progressive education. The hierarchical response to progressive

education was first found in the materials reviewed in the previous chapter and was further reinforced in the materials researched for this chapter. Progressive education was described as godless and inferior intellectually and, therefore, unsuitable for Catholic children. In view of this, Cormack's Minority Report, which favoured traditionalist or essentialist education rather than progressive education, was highly regarded by the Catholic hierarchy, even though he did not discuss the Catholic theory of schooling.

The Minutes of ACSTA (1958-1960) St. Albert Public and Edmonton, Red Deer, Wainwright and Vegreville Separate School Districts, (1947-1960) were mainly concerned with practical issues affecting Catholic schooling. However, despite the fact that the theory of Catholic schooling was not discussed nor defined in those Minutes, it could be concluded that ACSTA and the trustees of the individual boards accepted the theory of schooling which evolved between 1884 and 1905 and was reinforced between 1905 and 1960. Moreover, the trustees recognized the Archbishop of Edmonton as the highest authority on various aspects of Catholic schooling, consulted religious personnel on matters related to schooling and supported the position presented by the Catholic hierarchy to the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. The latter was clearly illustrated by the ACSTA submission to the commission.

The number of Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of Edmonton had increased considerably since Alberta gained provincial status mainly because of immigration. By 1960, the curricula of separate and public schools in Alberta were the same except for the religious

education component in the Catholic schools. However, despite the changes brought about by two world wars, numerous inventions and altered life-styles, the Catholic church had not revised its theory of schooling. In fact, Catholic leaders were clinging tenaciously to principles that had been laid down more than half-a-century earlier. The formation of the ACEA, an attempt to revive parental interest in the Catholic theory of schooling, was the hierarchy's response to the impasse. Therefore, it can be concluded that, even though the theory of Catholic schooling had remained essentially the same throughout the period of this study, increasing difficulty was being experienced by the Catholic school promoters in the Archdiocese of Edmonton in their efforts to maintain parental interest in the theory and practice of Catholic schooling. The challenge of progressive education, financial problems and apathy of Catholics had caused the leadership to realize that reinforcing the theory was not enough. Methods had to be employed to meet the new challenges facing Catholic education. The formation of the ACEA and ACSTA were responses to the problems perceived by the hierarchy.

Footnotes

[1]Western Catholic, May 21, 1947.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Alberta Catholic Education Association Bulletin, December 10, 1951.

[4]Ibid.

[5]J.H. MacDonald, Pastoral Letter, Edmonton Archdiocesan Archives, August 22, 1955. The Diocese of St. Albert had been divided into the Archdiocese of Edmonton and the Diocese of Calgary in 1912. Subsequently, the vicariate of Grouard (1927) and the Diocese of St. Paul (1948) had been established. The vicariate of Athabasca-MacKenzie had been in existence since 1862. In 1901 MacKenzie was established as an independent vicariate. The Ukrainian Diocese of Edmonton was established in 1956. It should be noted also that on April 17, 1955 Bishop A. Jordan had been appointed Coadjutor Archbishop of Edmonton with the right to succeed Archbishop MacDonald. (Sources: R.J. Carney, "Relations in Education Between the Federal and Territorial Governments and the Roman Catholic Church in the MacKenzie District, North West Territories, 1867-1961." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Alberta 1971; p. 654 Information received in telephone conversation with Sister M. Dupree, Archivist, Archdiocesan Archives, Edmonton, December 8, 1981.)

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid.

[8]J.H. MacDonald, Pastoral Letter, Archives, op. cit. March 2, 1956.

[9]Ibid.

[10]J.H. MacDonald, Pastoral Letter, May 1, 1956. Archives, op. cit.

[11]Ibid. The archbishop noted the following expenditures by Canadians in 1954: - Amount per head spent on (a) tobacco $31.26, (b) alcoholic drink $56.92, (c) education $40.26¢. Ibid.

[12]Joint Pastoral Letter, Archbishops and Bishops of Alberta, March 6, 1960. Archives, op. cit.

[13]Ibid. According to the Catholic hierarchy, Catholic education included two fundamentals: (1) concerns itself with the

whole man and (2) it regards him as a child of God. Catholic education aims to train man to act and live according to Christ's principles. The Catholic school exists to provide effective Christian character formation and the Catholic teacher is the most important and influential person in this process. Ibid.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]F.P. Carroll, "Christian Education," ACEA Pamphlet, April 10, 1947.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]F.P. Carroll, "The Apostolate of the Alberta Catholic Education Association," ACEA Pamphlet, April 10, 1947.

[21]Ibid.

[22]H. Routhier, "Christian Education," ACEA Pamphlet, April 1, 1948.

[23]Ibid.

[24]J.M. Hill, "Our Youth and Christian Living," ACEA Pamphlet, April 13, 1950. According to Hill, "The primary right of parents in the education of their children carries with it an obligation of equal seriousness to ensure their religious training. Where Catholic schools are available, the duty of Catholic parents to support them and to enrol their children in them is clear and incontestable." Ibid.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]P.F. Pocock, "Why a Catholic School?" ACEA Pamphlet, March 28, 1951. According to Bishop Pocock, Pius XI was simply repeating what Leo XIII had said many years before: "It is necessary not only that religious instruction be given to the young at certain fixed times, but also that every other subject taught be permeated with Christian piety. If this is wanting, if this sacred atmosphere does not pervade and warm the hearts of masters and pupils alike, little good can be expected from any kind of learning and considerable harm will often be the consequence." Ibid.

[28]Ibid.

[29]F.P. Carroll, "Catholic Objectives in Education, High Role of Parent and of Teacher," ACEA Pamphlet, April 13, 1955.

[30]Ibid.

[31]T.J. McCarthy, "Education and Sanity," ACEA Pamphlet, April 24, 1957.

[32]Ibid. McCarthy suggested that pragmatists affirmed that the truth at any one time is relative to the knowledge of the time. Therefore, they were convinced the truth was constantly being remade. Moreover, progressive education ignored the hereafter and, because of that, McCarthy regarded it as an incomplete, false system of education that would inevitably lead men astray. Catholic schooling was necessary to protect Catholic youth from these false prophets. Ibid.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]A. Jordan, "Speaking on Behalf of Children," ACEA Pamphlet, April 10, 1958. The basic tenets of Catholic education, summarized by Jordan, were that the home should be the first school and the basic source of the child's education and religious education, begun in the home, should be continued in the school. Teachers should treat religion as the most important subject in the curriculum and they should realize that teaching was a vocation, not a profession. Ibid.

[36]ACEA Bulletin, September 25, 1947.

[37]Ibid.

[38]ACEA Bulletin, May 1, 1948. The relevant resolutions read as follows: Be it resolved: That this ACEA in convention assembled, stress the necessity for Catholic schools and urge our Catholic people everywhere to maintain and set up, where financially possible, their own schools; Be it further resolved: That this ACEA urge the Government to give some consideration to the handicaps, financial and other, under which our Alberta Catholic schools are now operating; Be it resolved: That we ask pastors of churches everywhere to bring the urgent need for more Catholic teachers to the attention of their people and stress the importance to the church of the proper religious education of our youth. Ibid.

[39]Ibid. December 20, 1948.

[40]Ibid. April 2, 1949.

[41] Ibid. December 18, 1949. According to Gilles, the seven basic principles of Catholic education are:

(1) The universe was created by God and is governed by his Providence.
(2) Man is a creature composed of a body and an immortal soul, created by God for the purpose of serving Him on earth and attaining happiness with Him in heaven.
(3) Man is endowed with a conscience and a free will, and is therefore, responsible for his conduct, the norms of which are predetermined by the moral law. This moral law is immutable and independent of man.
(4) God created man with power to learn truths in the supernatural order which, because of man's limited capacity to learn, could not be learned otherwise.
(5) God bestowed on man originally, and, later, through baptism certain supernatural aids to conduct such as grace.
(6) There was such a thing as an original sin, a Fall, the consequences of which are still felt by man, even after baptism, in that he has an intellect less able to attain truth; a will less able to seek good; and a nature more inclined to evil than to good.
(7) Man by his very nature is a social being, having obligations to society, and in turn being affected by society. Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid. October 24, 1949.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid. October 30, 1950.

[46] Ibid. January 15, 1957.

[47] Ibid. October 5, 1956.

[48] Ibid. December 2, 1957.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid. April 5, 1950, December 12, 1950.

[51] Ibid. February 20, 1952.

[52] Ibid. April 2, 1953.

[53] Ibid. March 30, 1958.

[54] ACEA "Handbook for Regions," 1949, p. 1. In 1949 there were four regions -- Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. The ACEA Executive was hopeful that "the Regions in Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, will eventually become Master

Regions, and direct activities within their respective areas." Ibid. A new region could be formed if twelve or more members applied to the Executive for permission to operate as a study group under the supervision and control of the Executive. Ibid., p. 4.

[55]Ibid., Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights read as follows:

(1) Everyone has a right to an education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available, and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, it shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. Ibid., p. 16.

[56]ACEA Bulletin, December 18, 1949.

[57]Ibid., May 1, 1951.

[58]Ibid., April 5, 1950.

[59]Ibid., October 30, 1950.

[60]Ibid., April 5, 1954.

[61]Ibid.

[62]"ACTA Brief to Royal Commission," April 24, 1958. ACEA Bulletin, September 30, 1958.

[63]ACEA Bulletin, December 3, 1959.

[64]Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, Minority Report (1959), p. 442.

[65]Ibid., p. 390.

[66]ACEA Bulletin, February 26, 1960.

[67]Western Catholic, September 30, 1953.

[68]Ibid., March 10, 1954.

[69]Ibid., October 13, 1948.

[70]Ibid., August 15, 1951.

[71]Ibid., May 17, 1951.

[72]Ibid., June 29, 1949.

[73]Ibid., April 5, 1950.

[74]Ibid., March 25, 1953.

[75]Ibid., August 25, 1948; September 6, 1950.

[76]Ibid., March 10, 1954.

[77]Ibid., March 17, 1954.

[78]Ibid., December 9, 1959.

[79]Proceedings and Minutes, ACSTA 2nd Annual Convention, November 4-7, 1958.

[80]Ibid.

[81]Proceedings, ACSTA, Convention, November 4-7, 1958.

[82]Minutes, ACSTA, April 21, 1960.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Minutes, Edmonton Separate School District, May 14, 1951.

[85]Ibid., February 25, 1959.

[86]Minutes, Red Deer Separate School District, March 13, 1952.

[87]Ibid., November 12, 1953.

[88]Ibid., August 8, 1956.

[89]Ibid., November 7, 1960.

[90]Ibid., March 23, 1959.

[91]Minutes, Wainwright Separate School District, February 10, 1954.

[92]Ibid., July 26, 1953.

[93]*Minutes*, Vegreville Separate School District, June 11, 1948.

[94]*Ibid.*, October 19, 1960.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

The Catholic theory of schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese (1884-1960) was neither unique nor locally developed. Nineteenth century papal figures, such as Pius IX and Leo XIII, enunciated a number of themes regarding Catholic education which were accepted as the Catholic theory of schooling throughout the period of study.

In this study six of the major themes of the Catholic theory of schooling, enunciated by papal figures and accepted unquestioningly by American and Canadian Catholic leaders and more specifically by the Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese, were examined. These were the divine mission of the church to educate; the educational responsibilities of parents; the need for Catholic schools for all Catholic children; the permeation principle of Catholic schooling; the relationship between intellectual and moral/religious schooling; and the responsibilities and characteristics of teachers. These themes provided the basis of the Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese.

As stated in the first chapter, the term theory has been used throughout this study in the normative, conceptual, supernatural and directive contexts defined by Cohen, O'Connor, Wynne and Power. The Catholic theory of schooling utilizes a set of doctrines,

supported by supernatural beliefs but empirically indefensible. It is derived from Catholic ideology which is based on the Catholic belief system regarding the supernatural, the nature of man and the purpose of man's earthly existence.

The materials examined in this study included papal statements on schooling as well as books, articles and other materials that outlined American and English-Canadian Catholic responses to papal pronouncements on schooling. Local materials examined included pastoral letters and speeches on education by bishops and archbishops, Western Catholic reports, articles and other materials, Alberta Catholic Education Association (ACEA) Bulletins and Pamphlets, Alberta Catholic Trustees' Association Minutes and Minutes of some Catholic school districts within the Archdiocese. These materials confirmed that the theory of schooling developed by Vatican authorities was accepted unquestioningly by the American, Canadian and local Catholic hierarchies.

During the early territorial period a dual system of schooling existed in the North-West Territories. From 1885 to 1892 several school ordinances were passed that gradually changed the dual system to a unitary one with separate school rights guaranteed. From that time Catholics were no longer in complete control of their section of the territorial school system. Religious education was relegated to the last half-an-hour of the day and the atmosphere was deemed to be inconducive to effective promotion of the permeation principle. Nevertheless, in spite of this setback, Catholic schooling continued to be maintained. Moreover, Catholic spokesmen, like Father H. Leduc,

maintained that the territorial government had violated the British North America Act by depriving Catholics of their constitutional right to operate Catholic schools without government interference. When Alberta attained provincial status in 1905, the school clauses of the Autonomy Bill retained the existing schooling arrangements. From 1905 to 1920 Bishop E. Legal of the Archdiocese of Edmonton gained some minor concessions for Catholic schooling through lobbying and negotiating with the leaders of the Alberta Liberal government.

Throughout the years 1884-1920, the Catholic hierarchy in the Archdiocese reiterated the basic themes of Catholic schooling outlined by the papal authorities in the late nineteenth century. During that time the leaders of the local church were French-speaking members of the Oblate congregation. Since they were a missionary rather than a teaching order, it has been suggested that they relied on the popes for direction regarding schooling because of their lack of expertise in this area. Be that as it may, the Oblates fully endorsed papal directives on schooling and used whatever means at their disposal to try to gain concessions for Catholic schools from the provincial government.

From 1920 to 1964 Archbishops H.J. O'Leary and H.J. MacDonald directed the affairs of the Edmonton Archdiocese. O'Leary and MacDonald were neither Oblate nor French. However, like their French-speaking, Oblate predecessors, they reiterated the theory of Catholic schooling enunciated by Pius IX and Leo XIII. From 1930, many of the clerics who endorsed this theory credited Pius XI with its development. While Pius XI's Divini Ilius Magistri was important

to the Catholic theory of schooling, his educational directives were not original. His encyclical was merely a reiteration of the position outlined by his predecessors. Like the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton, Pius XI was reinforcing a theory that had been in existence since the nineteenth century but had been clearly defined by the Vatican in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The Catholic hierarchy in the Edmonton Archdiocese also relied on American Catholics for materials supportive of the theory. Because of the private status of Catholic schooling in the United States the American bishops and other spokesmen were more vociferous in their defence of Catholic schooling. In Alberta where partial government recognition was accorded Catholic schooling, the need to defend the Catholic theory of schooling was not so acute. However, because American materials were readily available, editors and columnists of the Western Catholic and the ACEA Bulletin as well as leading clerics within the Archdiocese used them to justify their position on Catholic schooling.

The phenomenon of a single theory of schooling that did not change between 1884 and 1960 is problematic. Rather than attempt to modify the theory to fit changing local conditions, the Catholic hierarchy in Edmonton constantly reiterated the basic themes of the existing theory. In "An Alternative Model for Research on Catholic Education" K. Westhues suggested that four variables could be responsible for Catholic church involvement in establishing schools; namely, "minority position, ethnicity, hostility of environment and

modernization."[1] Minority position was a factor throughout the period of the study. However, this issue was only prominent during the territorial period when it was used by Leduc to criticize the actions of the majority in denying Catholics their educational rights which were guaranteed by the constitution. Similarly, Leduc also suggested that the environment in the territories was generally hostile to Catholic schooling. This assumption concerning the environment continued throughout the period of study but was generally ignored by the hierarchy between 1905 and 1960. Ethnicity was definitely a factor with regard to French-language instruction in the territorial and early provincial period. This was a concern raised by Oblate leaders between 1884 and 1920. Further, French-language instruction continued to be an issue in the St. Albert Public School District after 1920. However, the phenomenon of ethnicity, apart from language, was generally ignored by the hierarchy. Therefore, the effects of ethnicity on the durability of the Catholic theory of schooling in the Edmonton Archdiocese is a matter of conjecture rather than fact.

It would be difficult to determine the effects of modernization on Catholic schooling in Edmonton. The hierarchical reaction to progressive education and to proposed curriculum changes such as "Enterprise education" provide some indication of their attitude to modernization. Cormack's traditionalist or essentialist approach in his Minority Report (1959) is similar to the hierarchical position on modernization. However, this is merely an assumption because curricula changes or decisions are beyond the scope of this

study. Hochstein[2] suggested that the curriculum of the public and Catholic schools in the province of Alberta was the same; the only difference between the two school systems was the religious component of Catholic schools. Hence, it can be concluded that the hierarchy was more concerned with retaining the religious aspect of Catholic schooling since they were aware that they could not control the academic programme. On several occasions they had asked for special concessions with regard to textbooks and readers. However, apart from Legal's success with regard to W. Scott's Marmion, their suggestions were generally ignored.

The four variables discussed above do not explain why the single theory was accepted unquestioningly by the local hierarchy throughout the period of study. Perhaps the prevalent viewpoint was that Catholics were expected to rally against the common enemy that wanted to abolish sectarian schools. This line of thinking probably originated in the territorial period when F. Haultain and D. Goggin raised the ire of Bishop V. Grandin and Father H. Leduc by advocating a system of non-sectarian national schools. Catholic leaders continued to uphold this position to 1960 as was apparent from the response of the Bishops of Alberta to the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (1959).

The theory of schooling remained essentially the same throughout the period of this study but the problems faced by the hierarchy changed over time. For example, in the territorial period emphasis was on total restoration of the rights that had been taken away. In the early provincial period Bishop E. Legal preferred to

negotiate for minor concessions and he did this successfully throughout his episcopate. From 1921, other issues came to the forefront. Some of these were financial problems affecting Catholic schooling, the threat of progressive education and pragmatism and apathy among Catholics with respect to fulfilling their obligation to send their children to Catholic schools. The hierarchy responded to each of these issues characteristically. With reference to financial problems they appealed to Catholics for assistance and lobbied the provincial Department of Education for changes in property tax allocation. Their response to progressive education and parental apathy did not include a re-examination of the theory of schooling to ascertain whether it needed to be modified in view of changes within society. Instead, they openly criticized pragmatism and progressive education which they described as Godless and undisciplined perspectives in which little appropriate learning took place. Further, to counteract parental apathy the ACEA was formed to investigate the problem of apathy among Catholic parents and devise a programme of action to reawaken the interest of indifferent Catholics in Catholic schooling for their children and elicit support for Catholic schools.

Why then was this theory so enduring? Was it a result of the siege-mentality of the minority or was it the outcome of the prevailing organizational structure of the pre-Vatican II Catholic church? It could be assumed that the single theory prevailed because of the siege-mentality created by the minority position which led to a defensive attitude on the part of the Catholic hierarchy.

As far as they were concerned the old adage "A house divided against itself cannot stand" had to be applied. Further, because the Catholic church is hierarchically structured with the pope as supreme head and the archbishops and bishops as the ultimate authority in their dioceses, the hierarchical position on schooling was not openly disputed by lay Catholics. In these circumstances, the theory of schooling, defined in papal statements and endorsed by the local hierarchy, was accepted unquestioningly by the active adherents of the Catholic faith in the Edmonton Archdiocese.

It has been apparent throughout this study that the replication of the theory over time was deemed to be sufficient by the hierarchy. It was assumed that if actions were appropriate there would be desirable outcomes. The theory remained unexamined, untested, unambiguous and based on perennial principles. The control that was exercised by the religious community was directly derived from Vatican documents.

As Lannie[3] found in his examination of Catholic historiography in the United States, there was a close relationship between church and school and the hierarchy maintained that Catholic schooling was essential to the preservation of the faith throughout this period. The Catholic press in the Archdiocese played an important role in encouraging Catholics to support Catholic schools both financially and physically.

The Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton did not change throughout the period of this study. All the major ideas regarding Catholic education, enunciated by papal

authorities in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, were repeated throughout the period. As explained earlier, details concerning demographic structure, text books and the nature of schools were not discussed in this study except as they were relevant to the articulation of the theory. This study is an attempt to examine the origins and the nature of the theory and the extent to which it changed over time. It can be concluded that the theory is closely related to the Catholic philosophy of life and religious belief system. It originated in papal documents and was accepted unquestioningly by the Catholic religious hierarchy throughout North America. It did not change over time but was reinforced by the local hierarchy, reiterated frequently and remained unexamined and untested throughout the period.

Suggestions For Further Study

Throughout this study a persistent question has been apparent. Did the Catholic schools of Edmonton really accomplish their goals? In other words, were the graduates of Catholic schools more religious and less worldly than the graduates of public schools? An interesting proposal for further study would be an attempt at a comparative survey of separate and public school graduates in the Archdiocese to determine the outcomes of the schooling process.

Another topic for further study could be a comparison of post-Vatican II Catholic schooling theory in the Archdiocese with the findings of this study. It would be interesting to find out if the theory changed, and determine the extent of this change and the

effects this has had on the type of student that has emerged from Catholic schools. Most likely the findings would be that many of the original themes continued to be replicated.

Westhues' hypothesis -- "that Catholic education arises out of a perception on the part of the Roman Catholic church of an environment threatening to itself"[4] and the four variables that elaborate that hypothesis, referred to earlier, provide an interesting approach for a sociological study of the motivation behind Roman Catholic schooling. Such a study would involve the use of demographic and socio-economic data to test the hypothesis.

The Catholic theory of schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton appeared to be similar to that throughout North America and in other parts of the world. Another area for research could be examination of the theory and practice of Catholic schooling in other parts of Canada. An attempt could also be made to determine if the practice of Catholic schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton followed the guidelines laid out by the theoreticians.

R. Currie's[5] study of religious commitment of Catholic youth in Calgary also provides an interesting area of research. A study of religious commitment among Catholic youth in Edmonton might assist in determining the outcomes of Catholic schooling. It could indicate whether insistence on Catholic schooling has resulted in greater commitment of Catholic youth to the perennial principles of Catholicism or if the youths merely pay lip-service to Catholic principles in school without being fully committed to the Catholic philosophy of life and rules of conduct.

It is hoped that the analysis in this study would be of benefit to individuals undertaking further research into the theory and practice of Catholic schooling in the Archdiocese of Edmonton.

Footnotes

[1]K. Westhues "An Alternative Model for Research on Catholic Education" American Journal of Sociology Vol. 77 No. 2, September 1971 p. 279.

[2]L.A. Hochstein "Roman Catholic Separate and Public Schools in Alberta." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1954.

[3]V.P. Lannie "Church and School Triumphant: The Sources of American Catholic Educational Historiography" History of Education Quarterly, Vol. 16 No. 2, 1976. pp. 131-145.

[4]Westhues op. cit., p. 279.

[5]R.F. Currie "Belonging, Commitment and Early Socialization in a Western City" Religion in Canadian Society Crysdale, S. and Wheatcroft, L. eds. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Limited 1976 pp. 462-478.

Bibliography

I. Unpublished Materials

A. Archdiocesan Documents and School Jurisdiction Minutes

Archbishop and Bishops of Alberta. "Pastoral Letter," March 6, 1960. Edmonton: Archdiocesan Archives.

Grandin, V. "Pastoral Letters," 1884-1901. Edmonton: Provincial Archives.

Fathers of the First Plenary Council of Quebec. "Pastoral Letter," November 1, 1909. Edmonton: Provincial Archives.

Legal, E. "Pastoral Letters," 1902-1920. Edmonton: Provincial Archives.

MacDonald, J.H. "Pastoral Letters," 1939-1960. Edmonton: Archdiocesan Archives.

O'Leary, H.J. "Pastoral Letters," 1920-1938. Edmonton: Archdiocesan Archives.

Minutes, Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association, 1958-1960.

Minutes, Edmonton Separate School District, 1919-1960.

Minutes, Red Deer Separate School District, 1920-1960.

Minutes, St. Albert Public School District, 1911-1941, 1958-1960.

Minutes, Vegreville Separate School District, 1948-1960.

Minutes, Wainwright Separate School District, 1932-1960.

B. Theses and Papers

Carney, R.J. "Relations in Education Between the Federal and Territorial Governments and the Roman Catholic Church in the MacKenzie District, North West Territories, 1867-1961." Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

_____. "Winners are Losers." Paper Presented at the Alberta Catholic Trustees' Association Provincial Planning Conference, University of Calgary, May 3-8, 1981.

Foster, L.E. "A Sociological Analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1957-1959." Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.

Goresky, I. "The Beginning and Growth of the Alberta School System." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1944.

Hart, E.J. "The History of the French-Speaking Community of Edmonton, 1795-1935." Master of Arts Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Hochstein, L.A. "Roman Catholic Separate and Public Schools in Alberta." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1954.

Kistler, R.B. "Religion, Education and Language as Factors in French Canadian Cultural Survival." Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, New York University, 1947.

Maclean, R. "The History of the Roman Catholic Church in Edmonton." Master of Arts Thesis, University of Alberta, 1958.

McDonald, N. "The School as an Agent of Nationalism in the North-West Territories, 1884-1905." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Patterson, R.S. "F.W.G. Haultain and Education in the Early West." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

Rusak, S.T. "Relations in Education between Bishop Legal and the Alberta Liberal Government, 1905-1920." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

Selinger, A. "The Contributions of D.J. Goggin to the Development of Education in the North-West Territories, 1893-1902." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1960.

Skwarok, J. "The Ukrainian Settlers and Their Schools (with reference to Government, French Canadian and Ukrainian Missionary Influences) 1891-1921." Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1958.

Sparby, H.T. "A History of the Alberta School System to 1925." Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, Stanford University, 1958.

II. Published Materials

A. Newspapers, Bulletins, Pamphlets and Reports

Alberta Catholic Education Association: Bulletin, 1947-1960.

Alberta Catholic Education Association: Pamphlet, 1947-1960.

Alberta: Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959.

Alberta Advocate (Red Deer) 1905.

Calgary Herald 1903-1905.

Edmonton Bulletin 1903-1905.

Lethbridge News 1904-1905.

Western Catholic 1921-1960.

B. Books

Bandas, R.G. Religion Teaching and Practice. New York: Joseph F. Wagner Inc., 1939.

Card, B.Y. The Canadian Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950: A Sociological Introduction. Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons (Canada) Limited, 1960.

Careless, J.M.S. Canada: A Story of Challenge (Revised edition). Laurentian Library 30. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada Limited, 1974.

Cashman, T. Edmonton's Catholic Schools: A Success Story. Edmonton: Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School District #7 (Jasper Printing Limited) 1977.

Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: 1912. 15 Vols.

Chalmers, J.W. Schools of the Foothills Province. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Cohen, P.S. Modern Social Theory. London: Heinemann Publishers, 1968.

Daly, G.T. Catholic Problems in Western Canada. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1921.

De Ferrari, R.J. (ed.). Essays on Catholic Education in the United States. New York: Catholic University of America Press, 1942.

De Hovre, F. and Jordan, E.B. Catholicism in Education. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1934.

_____. Philosophy and Education. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930.

Duchaussois, P. Hidden Apostles: Our Lay Brother Missionaries. Dawson, T. translator. New York: Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 1937.

_____. Mid Snow and Ice: The Apostles of the North-West. Dawson, T. translator. New York: Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 1937.

Gallagher, D. & I. (eds.). The Education of Man: The Educational Philosophy of Jacques Maritain. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962.

Grant, J.W. (ed.). The Church in the Canadian Era: The First Century of Confederation, Vol. III of A History of the Christian Church in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1972.

Hales, E.E.Y. The Catholic Church in the Modern World. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1958.

Hallett, P.H. What is a Catholic? New York: Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1961.

Jaenen, C. The Role of the Church in New France. Montreal: McGraw Hill, 1976.

Kandel, I.L. Conflicting Theories of Education. New York: Russell and Russell, 1967.

Kolesnik, W.B. & Power, E.J. (eds.). Catholic Education: A Book of Readings. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1965.

Leduc, H. Hostility Unmasked: School Ordinance of 1892 of the North-West Territories and Its Disastrous Results. Montreal: C.O. Beauchemin and Son, 1896.

Lee, J.M. (ed.). Catholic Education in the Western World. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Lower, A.R.M. Canadians in the Making: A Social History of Canada. Don Mills: Longmans, 1965.

Lupul, M.R. The Roman Catholic Church and the North-West School Question: a study in church-state relations in Western Canada, 1875-1905. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

MacRae, A.O. History of the Province of Alberta Volume I. Western Canadian History Company, 1912.

Magnuson, R. A Brief History of Quebec Education. Montreal: Harvest House Limited, 1980.

Mannheim, K. Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1936.

Maritain, J. Education at the Crossroads. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

McCluskey, N.G. Catholic Viewpoint on Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1959.

McGlade, J. Progressive Educators and the Catholic Church. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1953.

McGucken, W.J. The Catholic Way in Education. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934.

Monet, J. The Last Canon Shot: A Study of French-Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Monière, D. Ideologies in Quebec: The Historical Development. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Neatby, H.M. So Little For The Mind. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company Limited, 1953.

O'Connor, D.J. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1957.

O'Neill, J.M. Catholicism and American Freedom. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

O'Neill, J.M. The Catholic Church in Secular Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Company Inc., 1956.

Ong, W.J. Frontiers in American Catholicism. New York: MacMillan Company, 1957.

Power, E.J. Evolution of Educational Doctrine: Major Educational Theorists of the Western World. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Educational Division. Meredith Corporation, 1969.

Rebeschini, A. (translator). Papal Teachings: Education (selected and arranged by the Benedictine Monks of Solesmes). Boston: The Daughters of St. Paul, 1960.

Redden, J.D. & Ryan, F.A. A Catholic Philosophy of Education. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1942.

Shortt, A. & Doughty, A.G. (eds.). Canada and its Provinces, Vol. XX, Section X, "The Prairie Provinces." Toronto: Glasgow Brook and Company, 1914.

Shuster, G.N. Catholic Education in a Changing World. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Sissons, C.B. Church and State in Canadian Education. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959.

Thomas, L.G. (ed.). The Prairie West to 1905. Toronto: Oxford University Press (Canadian Branch), 1975.

Thomas, L.H. The Struggle for Responsible Government in the North-West Territories, 1870-79. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956.

Wade, M. The French Canadians 1760-1967 (Vol. I, 1760-1911). Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada, 1968.

Walsh, H.H. The Christian Church in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1956.

Weir, G.M. The Separate School Question in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1934.

Wilson, J.D., Stamp, R.M., and Audet, L.P. Canadian Education: A History. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada Limited, 1970.

Wynne, J.P. Theories of Education: An Introduction to the Foundations of Education. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc., 1963.

Young, C.H. The Ukrainian Canadians. Toronto: Nelson and Company, 1931.

C. Articles

Banim, F.E. "The Centenary of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate," The Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report. (1941-42) pp. 29-33.

Bishop, R.J. "Book Review" (A Catholic Philosophy of Education, Redden and Ryan) The Modern Schoolman. Vol. 20 (1942-43) pp. 51-52.

Cappon, J. "The Principle of Sectarianism in the Canadian Constitution," Queen's Quarterly (April 1905). pp. 425-442.

Carlton, R.A. "Popular Images of the School," Education, Change and Society. Carlton, R.A., Colley, L.A. and MacKinnon, N.J. eds. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Limited, 1977.

Cochrane, E. "What is Catholic Historiography?" The Catholic Historical Review, Vol. LXI No. 2 (April 1975) pp. 169-90.

Cormack, J.S. "Then and Now in Alberta's Education," The Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report, Vol. 15-16 (1947-48) pp. 61-69.

Currie, R.F. "Belonging, Commitment and Early Socialization in a Western City," Religion in Canadian Society. Crysdale, S. and Wheatcroft, L. eds. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Limited 1976, pp. 462-478.

Farge, M.J. "Brownson and the Common Schools: Nativism in an American Catholic," Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report. Vol. 29 (1962) pp. 25-40.

Henle, R.J. "An Essay in Educational Theory," The Modern Schoolman, Vol. 25 (1945-1946), pp. 107-125.

_____. "Philosophy and Education," The Modern Schoolman, Vol. 26 (1948-49), pp. 148-158.

Huel, R.J.A. "French-Speaking Bishops and the Cultural Mosaic in Western Canada," Religion and Society in the Prairie West. R. Allen (ed.). Canadian Plains Studies 3, Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1974. pp. 53-64.

Lannie, V.P. "Church and School Triumphant: The Sources of American Catholic Educational Historiography," History of Education Quarterly, Vol. 16, No. 2, 1976. pp. 131-145.

Lupul, M.R. "Religion and Education in Canada: A Call for an End to Hypocrisy," Journal of Education Thought, Vol. 3 No. 3 (December 1969), pp. 141-50.

_____. "Rejoinder to Communications on Religion and Education in Canada." Journal of Educational Thought. Vol. 4 No. 2 (August 1970) pp. 119-24.

McDonald, N.G. "Alexander A. Taché, Defender of the Old Regime," Profiles of Canadian Educators. Patterson, R.S., Chalmers, J.W. and Friesen, J.W. eds. D.C. Heath, Canada Limited, 1974.

_____. "David J. Goggin, Promoter of National Schools," Profiles of Canadian Educators. Patterson, R.S., Chalmers, J.W. and Friesen, J.W., eds. D.C. Heath Canada Limited, 1974.

Monet, J. "French-Canadian Nationalism and the Challenge of Ultramontanism." Canadian History before Confederation: Essays and Interpretations. B umsted, J.M. ed. Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972. pp. 384-399.

Shils, E. "Ideology," The Intellectuals and the Powers and Other Essays. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972. pp. 23-41.

Westhues, K. "An Alternative Model for Research on Catholic Education," American Journal of Sociology, Volume 77 No. 2 (1971) pp. 279-293.

_____. "The Adaptation of the Roman Catholic Church in Canadian Society," Religion in Canadian Society. Crysdale, S. and Wheatcroft, L. eds. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1976. pp. 290-306.